

No. 1519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 3384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 566. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3442, a bill to amend sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended (40 Stat. 533; U. S. C., title 50, secs. 101, 102, and 103); without amendment (Rept. No. 1517). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 551. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1523). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 230. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor to conduct and investigate the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 4890. A bill to provide for the display in the lobbies of post offices of placards containing certain information with respect to the legislative representatives of the people; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4891. A bill to provide during the present war for certain additional compensation for star-route contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4892. A bill relating to clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MCKENZIE:

H. R. 4893. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 4894. A bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended (relating to certain nonmailable matter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give preference to governmental agencies which are wholly supported by public funds in the disposition of the surplus material, equipment, and ma-

chinery which will remain in the possession of the United States of America at the conclusion of the present war; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4895. A bill for the relief of James E. Monaghan as administrator of the estate of Katherine Monaghan, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4896. A bill for the relief of Florence E. Bower, Hulda Bower, and Christopher Russell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 4897. A bill for the relief of Joseph C. Eastland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4898. A bill granting a pension to William I. Ray; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5759. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Cold Spring Businessmen's Association protesting the enactment of Senate bill 1161; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5760. Also, resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y., having to do with the disposition of public war housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5761. By Mr. COLE of Missouri: Petition of Julia B. Hines and 58 other citizens of Buchanan County, Mo., protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5762. Also, petition of Clarence O. Smith and 29 other citizens of Buchanan County, Mo., protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5763. Also, petition of Bertis D. Johnson and 31 other citizens of Buchanan County, Mo., protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5764. Also, petition of Harry F. Miller and 27 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5765. Also, petition of Henry P. Curtin and 56 other citizens of Buchanan County, Mo., protesting against the consideration of any type of prohibition legislation until the conclusion of the present war and the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5766. By Mr. DAY: Seventy-one petitions, comprising approximately 1,800 names of citizens, relatives, and friends of Japanese war prisoners, supporting House Joint Resolution 252 and House Joint Resolution 253, introduced by Representative JESSIE SUMNER of Illinois; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5767. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of 159 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against House bill 2082, providing for the return of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 29, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of the living and of the living dead, Thou hast set us to play our part in a struggling world where there is no gain except by loss and no life except by death. With tenderness and gratitude we think of those quiet acres, some fringed by gently waving palms, all marked by the sacred cross of sacrifice, where at home and abroad sleep the mortal forms of the crusaders of liberation who in youth's high elation marched and sailed from this free land which has solemnly pledged its all that freedom may not die. Shadows of sorrow darken our hearts with the consciousness that they will come not back, for on alien sod they gave up the years and joys to be. But we rejoice with them that their souls will go marching on in a world cleansed of the bestial abomination whose blighting breath pollutes and desecrates but whose destruction is pledged by the sword of the unenslaved, in the name of the holy God and a holy humanity.

Make us worthy of those whose graves we garnish on our Day of Remembrance,

"Who more than self their country loved
And mercy more than life."

We ask it in the name of that One whose truth makes us and all men free. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SHERIDAN DOWNEY, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], heretofore named by me to perform the duties of the Chair, being, as I am informed, absent from the Senate today on official business.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DOWNEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 25, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that

the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 26, 1944:

S. 254. An act for the relief of Edward Gillam;

S. 1618. An act to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes; and

S. 1771. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes.

On May 27, 1944:

S. 771. An act to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 25th instant,

A message was received from the House of Representatives by the Secretary of the Senate on May 26, 1944, informing the Senate that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma):

S. 683. An act to provide for the recognition of the service of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal;

H. R. 4646. An act to provide for simplification of the individual income tax; and

H. R. 4793. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3570) to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 166) to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1929. An act to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 329. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor;

H. R. 1628. An act for the relief of John Hirsch;

H. R. 1635. An act for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search;

H. R. 1984. An act for the relief of Paul Barrere;

H. R. 2008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel;

H. R. 2105. An act extending the time for repayment and authorizing increase of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians;

H. R. 2143. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Christian Wenz;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson;

H. R. 2438. An act for the relief of Bernadine Salmons;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.;

H. R. 2689. An act for the relief of Pete Paluck;

H. R. 2757. An act for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallop, and Mrs. Dora Projansky;

H. R. 3028. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of Ruth Coe;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons;

H. R. 3403. An act to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of Bessie Eason;

H. R. 3570. An act to provide for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3848. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources;

H. R. 4054. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 4710. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth annual report of that Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO MOBILIZE THE PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES OF SMALL BUSINESS

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, approved June 11, 1942 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW NO. 47, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation extending the provisions of Public Law 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to reemployment committeemen of the Selective Service System (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION UNDER SECTION 217 (b) OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh report of the War Shipping Administration of action taken under section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury (2), War (9), Navy (6), and Agriculture (4); The National Archives, and United States District Court for the District of Nebraska which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Louisiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to give preference to governmental agencies which are wholly supported by public funds in the disposition of the surplus material, equipment, and machinery which will remain in the possession of the United States of America at the conclusion of the present war

"Whereas at the end of the present great war, the Government of the United States of

America will be in possession of a large amount of surplus material, equipment, and machinery which has been and will have been paid for from public funds realized from the levy of taxes upon the citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas in order that the public may receive, in the hour of victory, full benefit from the said surplus material, equipment, and machinery: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana concurring), That this legislature request of the Congress of the United States that it provide that in the disposition of any such surplus material, equipment, and machinery by the United States, before or after the conclusion of the war, all governmental agencies which are wholly supported by public funds, either Federal or State, shall by preference be entitled to purchase the same; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives be and he is hereby directed to forward official copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress."

Resolutions of the Central Labor Council of Phoenix, Ariz., and the Central Labor Council of San Mateo County, Calif., favoring the adoption of measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of congressional proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Westernport and Luke Civic Club of Westernport, Md., favoring the enacting of legislation to make more liberal provision for relief of the blind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Louisiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Members of Congress from this State not to support any further appropriation to the Office of Price Administration, unless the Office of Price Administration fixes higher ceilings on rough rice and strawberries

"Whereas the farmers of the State of Louisiana are doing all within their power to assist in the prosecution of the war against our enemies, but that the producers of rice and strawberries: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana (the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana concurring), That this legislature do request and recommend to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the State of Louisiana that they vote against any further appropriation for the continuance of this Office of Price Administration, unless Congress direct and provide, as to such appropriation, that the Office of Price Administration fix higher ceiling prices on rough rice and strawberries; be it further

"Resolved, that the clerk of the house of representatives and he is hereby directed to forward official copies of this resolution to each Senator and Representative of the State of Louisiana in the Congress of the United States."

VETERANS' BENEFITS—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a petition from the Fathers of Sons and Daughters in the Armed Forces and members of the Arkansas City Chapter of the American War Dads, of Kansas City, Kans., asking for the passage of H. R. 3938, H. R. 3940, H. R. 3941, H. R. 4115, H. R. 3945, and S. 1547, all of which have been approved by the Na-

tional Council of War Dads. I ask unanimous consent to have this petition inserted in the Record without all the signatures attached, and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the Record, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the Fathers of Sons and Daughters in the Armed Forces and members of the Arkansas City Chapter of the American War Dads, respectfully request that when the following bills come up on the floor for consideration that you vote for them.

H. R. 3935, introduced January 11, by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. To authorize an appropriation of \$500,000,000, earmarked for the Veterans' Administration, to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities.

H. R. 3938, introduced January 11, by Mr. McMILLAN, of South Carolina. To provide that in determining annual income any payments by the United States covering disability or death under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration or payments of insurance or contributory social-security benefits shall not be considered.

H. R. 3940, introduced January 11, by Mr. LAFOLLETTE, of Indiana. To provide compulsory retirement of Federal employees who have rendered 30 years' service and payment to such employees of an annuity of not less than \$1,200.

H. R. 3940, introduced January 11, by Mr. SCANLON, of Pennsylvania. To give credit for service in the military or naval forces in civil service examinations and classifications in positions requiring similar types of experience.

H. R. 4115. Give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment when Federal funds are used.

H. R. 3945, introduced January 11, by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. To prohibit exclusion from cemeteries of grave markers supplied by United States Government for deceased veterans.

S. 1547, payment of a minimum 240 monthly installments on National Service Life Insurance.

S. 1547, recommends legislation making insurance under the National Life Insurance Act effective as of the date of application therefor.

And all other bills approved by National Council of War Dads.

H. V. HOWARD,
W. BONEWELL,
J. H. BOEHNER,
LYSLE BURNS
(And sundry other citizens
of Kansas City, Kans.).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1825. A bill to extend the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 916).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

From the Committee on Military Affairs: H. R. 1506. A bill to further amend the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942; with amendments (Rept. No. 917).

From the Committee on Finance:

S. 1933. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the provisions of the Sugar Act of

1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; without amendment (Rept. No. 918).

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 4348. A bill to amend the act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 920).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1877. A bill to transfer Georgetown County, S. C., from the Florence division to the Charleston division of the eastern judicial district of South Carolina; without amendment (Rept. No. 921).

INCREASE OF THE DEBT LIMIT—REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back favorably, with an amendment, House bill 4464, to increase the debt limit of the United States and I submit a report (No. 919) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. GEORGE. I give notice that I will ask for consideration of the bill on next Wednesday.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 26, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 683) to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1954. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States," approved July 12, 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1955. A bill to amend Public Law 101, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. HILL):

S. 1956. A bill to provide for a Department of Armed Forces, Secretary of the Armed Forces, Under Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. VANDENBERG introduced Senate bill 1957, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AUSTIN:

S. 1958. A bill for the relief of fire district No. 1 of the town of Colchester, Vt.; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Interstate Commerce Committee is considering a new radio code, I ask consent to introduce for the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] a bill to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of any noncommercial, cultural, educational programs. The bill would be presented by the Sena-

tor from Idaho if he were not necessarily out of the city, he being chairman of the special committee which has been investigating this matter. The chief and important objective is to release music of American school children from the domination of James Caesar Petrillo. I introduce the bill, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1957) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to prohibit interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial cultural, educational programs, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4879) making appropriations for war agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RIVER AND HARBOR FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4485) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 814) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION RELATING TO IMMIGRATION AND DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

Mr. HOLMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 296), which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the immigration of aliens into and the deportation of aliens from the United States with a view to determining among other things, (1) the extent to which aliens have been permitted to enter or remain in the United States in violation of the immigration laws, (2) whether any deficiencies exist in the immigration or deportation laws or in the administration thereof which permit undesirable or deportable aliens or aliens who compete with citizens of the United States in securing employment to enter or remain in the United States, and (3) necessary steps to be taken in order to correct any such deficiencies and to prevent the continuation of any violation or circumvention of the immigration or deportation laws. The committee or subcommittee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth and

successing Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ADMISSION OF EUROPEAN WAR REFUGEES TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am about to send to the desk a resolution for submission and reference, but before sending it forward I wish to make a brief allusion to it.

Several years ago, at the outbreak of the war, Nazi Germany embarked upon a program for the consummation of one of the most despicable crimes of history, if not the most despicable, looking to the mass murder and extermination of a race of people. According to well authenticated reports, they have destroyed between four and five million people, and are engaged in attempting to destroy the pitiful remnants of this group.

In March 1943 the Congress of the United States, taking cognizance of this situation by concurrent resolution, expressed its condemnation of what it called the mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children.

Subsequent to the passage of that resolution 11 Members of this body joined with me in the presentation of a resolution urging the President of the United States to set up a board, composed of diplomatic, financial, and military experts, to study the matter, and devise ways and means of rescuing the remnants of these people. The resolution was reported unanimously to this body by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and immediately after that the President of the United States created such a Board, composed of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War as the War Rescue Board. This Board has been functioning through agents which it has selected, and has accomplished wonderful things in the progress it has made in the direction of its goal, but it has reached a point where it needs help. In that connection I am going to impose on the Senate by reading a press dispatch which certainly challenges the attention of anyone who has a spark of human decency in his heart. The press dispatch is dated Istanbul, May 1944, and is as follows:

According to official diplomatic dispatches, the Hungarian Government of Premier Deome Sztójay has launched a program of torture and extermination of the wandering Jews now in that country. Vast gas chambers (and gas baths) of the Nazi pattern are being erected for carrying out this mass execution.

The present large number of Jews in Hungary is in part due to the fact that many refugees, escaping from Poland and other countries, found temporary sanctuary, or at least

comparative safety, in that country. Now that the Nazis have taken over, the picture has changed overnight.

It is reported that a total of five and one-half million Jews have been put to death—one way or another—since the war began. Of these, literally hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children perished in the so-called gas baths of Poland. A common Nazi practice was to herd the intended victims into sanitary baths as they came off the cattle trains in Poland, on the pretext of cleansing them before their transshipment to the Ukraine for colonization. Actually these sanitary baths were lethal chambers from which no one came out alive.

A neutral diplomat, writing in official press dispatches, condemns the present Hungarian Government, saying, "Were I not here to witness it with my own eyes, I would never have believed that Magyars were capable of perpetrating such inhuman acts against honest, law-abiding citizens, whose only sin is that they are members of the faith which is the mother of Christianity. Never in my career was I so eager to be relieved of my post as I am today. The cruelty of the Government is beyond my comprehension, and I fail to understand how men calling themselves gentlemen and aristocrats can be so heartless and brutal to their fellow men."

Mr. President, that concludes the statement of the diplomat and also the press dispatch.

The resolution which I am submitting has one purpose, and one only, namely, the purpose of saving human lives. It has nothing to do with Palestine or with the political problems involving providing a homeland for the Jewish people. It has nothing to do with Zionism. It has nothing to do with a Palestinian army. It has nothing to do with changing in any way our immigration laws or policies. It merely looks to provision for the temporary admission of some of these Jews and other special victims of Nazi brutality who have been marked for extermination and slaughter to Ellis Island or other reception centers, where they will be detained and cared for until they can be returned to their homes without the risk of losing their lives at the hands of our vicious enemies.

We have in this country at the present moment more than 100,000 prisoners of war. With the further success of our arms we will probably have hundreds of thousands more. These men have borne arms against this Nation. We are feeding and clothing them, and when the war is over they will be returned safely to their homes. This is in accordance with accepted standards of decency and humanity in international relationships. We ought at least to do this much for the thousands of harmless and defenseless people who are the especial victims of Nazi brutality and sadism and who have committed no crimes but have been marked for brutal death for no reason other than their racial derivation or religious adherence.

America has historically been the sanctuary for the oppressed peoples of the earth. It was, in fact, founded by refugees, and it was founded for refugees. Refugees have, in large measure, built our America of today. This resolution merely reasserts a traditional policy of

the United States in the way of a temporary sanctuary for tragically helpless people. I believe that every true American will endorse it.

Mr. President, I ask consent to submit the resolution and hope it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 297), submitted by Mr. GILLETTE, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States by concurrent resolution adopted on March 10, 1944, expressed its condemnation of Nazi Germany's mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children; and

Whereas the American tradition of justice and humanity demands every possible measure to save the surviving Jews of Europe from extermination by Nazi torture; and

Whereas 2,000,000 lives are in immediate peril for want of a temporary sanctuary from their persecutors: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States urge upon the President of the United States that it is the will of the American people, expressed through their elected Representatives, that Jews and other special victims of Nazi hatred hereafter escaping from territory occupied by Nazi Germany and its allies, as determined by the War Refugee Board, be received on Ellis Island or other designated reception centers for temporary detention and care until the President has determined that they may be returned to their homeland without undue risk of their personal safety; and that transportation and other facilities be made available for this purpose, consistent with the effective prosecution of the war.

THE MONTGOMERY WARD CASE—EXCERPT FROM REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD pages 1, 2, 3, and the first five paragraphs of page 4, down to the subtitle III, "Recommendations," of the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary pursuant to Senate Resolution 252, dealing with the Montgomery Ward case.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL OR STATUTORY AUTHORITY OF CERTAIN EXECUTIVE ORDERS—REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 252

Senate Resolution 252, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved February 7, 1944, reads in part, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, for the information of the Senate and as a basis for any legislation the committee may deem it advisable to recommend, is hereby authorized and directed to study, survey, and report to the Senate not later than the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the constitutional or statutory authority upon which any or all Executive orders issued by the President since March 4, 1933, were based, and, likewise, the statutory or constitutional basis upon which directives, rules, and regulations have been issued during the same period by or under the authority of any Executive department or independent agency of the United States Government."

I. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Pursuant to the above resolution, on April 26, 1944, a subcommittee of the Committee

on the Judiciary of the United States Senate was appointed, composed of Senators PAT MCCARRAN, chairman, ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, and CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, to conduct the investigation, to make a study and to report its findings.

This report will deal solely with the action of the President and the various Government agencies in connection with the seizure of the Chicago facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. by the Federal Government pursuant to Executive Order 9438, dated April 25, 1944. Since the subcommittee is submitting this report pursuant to Senate Resolution 252, the merits of the labor dispute between the United Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Employees of America, a union affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations (hereinafter referred to as the union) and Montgomery Ward & Co. (hereinafter referred to as the company), will not be discussed. The Congress has provided means of adjusting labor disputes and it is not within the province of the Committee on the Judiciary, under this resolution to inquire into such disputes. It is within the province of the committee to determine whether the various executive agencies involved in this dispute have complied with the law. The report will point out those instances in which this has not been done, and will make such recommendations as to the committee seem desirable. It should be emphasized that the committee is not a court and therefore will not adjudicate the labor controversy involved, nor attempt to determine the rights or rectitude of either the company or the union.

This report will recapitulate the facts as they appear in the fully documented records of the Government agencies; the facts uncovered during the investigation at Chicago, Ill.; will summarize the legal and constitutional questions raised by these facts; and will resolve those questions with conclusions and recommendations.

II. CONCLUSIONS

The subcommittee finds:

1. That the Conciliation Service, Department of Labor, apparently has no facts in its files which would justify the finding that the union-company controversy in 1942 was one "which might interrupt work which contributes to the effective prosecution of the war," notwithstanding that such a certification was made by the Conciliation Service on June 2, 1942 (pursuant to sec. 3 of Executive Order 9017 which required the Department of Labor to make such a finding when certifying a labor dispute to the War Labor Board).

2. That the records of the National War Labor Board fail to disclose facts which support the determination of the National War Labor Board that the company-union dispute was one that "might interrupt work which contributes to the effective prosecution of the war," when the Board took jurisdiction of the labor dispute on June 29, 1942, pursuant to Executive Order 9017.

3. That the National War Labor Board was acting within the scope of its authority, under Executive Order 9017, to "finally determine the dispute," when it issued its directive order of November 5, 1942, prescribing the terms of the bargaining agreement between the company and the union.

4. That the Conciliation Service, Department of Labor, did not make any investigation upon which to base its certification of December 6, 1943 (other than to receive the uncorroborated statements of the company and the union), notwithstanding that section 7 of the War Labor Disputes Act requires the Conciliation Service to find "that a labor dispute exists which may lead to substantial interference with the war effort, and cannot be settled by collective bargaining or conciliation," when it certifies a dispute to the War Labor Board.

5. That the action taken by the National War Labor Board when on January 13, 1944, it assumed jurisdiction of a labor dispute involving a mail-order house, a retail store, and a warehouse of Montgomery Ward & Co., at Chicago, Ill., is inconsistent with the action taken on April 15, 1944, by the National War Labor Board (Chicago region) when it declined to exercise jurisdiction of a labor dispute involving a mail-order house and a retail store of Sears, Roebuck & Co. at Minneapolis, Minn., stating as reasons therefor: (1) Sears was not engaged in war production and (2) the dispute rightly belonged under the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board.

6. That the War Labor Board applied a distorted and unwarranted interpretation of section 7 of the War Labor Disputes Act when, on January 13, 1944, the Board ordered reestablished for a period of 30 days the terms of an expired contract between the company and the union, which contract had then been nonexistent for a period of 36 days. In ordering reestablishment of the contract for a 30-day period the War Labor Board was naming the union as the bargaining agency for that period, and to that extent was exercising powers given exclusively to the National Labor Relations Board by the National Labor Relations Act.

7. That after having issued the order of January 13, 1944, the National War Labor Board failed to "provide for terms and conditions * * * which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case," when, on April 5, 1944, the Board excused the union from pressing its petition for an election with the National Labor Relations Board until such time as the company complied with the Board's previous order of January 13, 1944. The War Labor Board did not note that the union also failed to follow the Board's directive order of January 13, 1944, in that the union did not file its petition with the National Labor Relations Board within the time limit prescribed by the National War Labor Board.

8. That the National War Labor Board had the right to seek, and the Board should have sought, a Federal court order to enforce its directive orders of January 13 and April 5, 1944. That its failure to do so is evidence of the Board's reluctance to have its orders reviewed by the Federal courts.

9. That the National Labor Relations Board is properly chargeable with dilatory tactics in a matter of great urgency. The union filed a petition with the Board on February 14, 1944. It was not until May 2, 1944, and after the Government had seized the facilities, that the Board rendered its decision ordering an election to be held. By failing to act promptly, the Board aggravated the situation.

10. That at the present time a certification of a particular bargaining agency by the National Labor Relations Board is presumed in law to continue valid and binding until a contrary decision is made by the National Labor Relations Board.

11. That the letter dated April 22, 1944, from the Attorney General to the President of the United States, which presumably was the impelling force for the issuance of the Executive order, contains erroneous, misleading, irrelevant, and immaterial statements and allegations, which have tended to confuse rather than to clarify the facts in the minds of the people of the United States.

12. That the Attorney General's letter to the President not only recites facts which are unconfirmed by the records of the Federal departments and agencies concerned with the labor controversy, but also contains conclusions which are inconsistent with and unsubstantiated by the facts which he recites. Upon the record the committee considers particularly unwarranted and untenable the

conclusion that the dispute between the company and its employees could not be settled promptly and peacefully without resort to Executive order. (See conclusion 8.)

13. That the Attorney General was misadvised when he stated that the President of the United States had the authority to issue the proposed Executive order "under section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act." The fact that section 3 of the War Labor Disputes Act constituted an amendment of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and therefore must be read and construed in context with other provisions of that section, apparently escaped the attention of the Attorney General. So read and construed, no interpretation of the new language added to section 9 will support the Attorney General's contention.

Under an application of this rule of construction in its broadest sense, the power of the President to take possession and control of a plant, mine, or facility in the event of a strike is subject to the earlier provisions of the section, and therefore limited to cases in which the company (1) shall refuse to give to the United States preference in the matter of the execution of orders; or (2) shall refuse to manufacture, produce, or mine the kind, quantity, or quality of the articles or materials ordered; or (3) shall refuse to furnish such articles or materials at a reasonable price.

Applied in its narrowest sense, this rule of construction still requires that the words "plant, mine, or facility equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining" be interpreted in the light of the general intent of section 9, and such interpretation clearly negatives any construction that the word "production" is broad enough to include distribution. The Attorney General's letter does not recite, and your committee has been unable to discover, any facts tending to show that the Chicago facilities of the company are "equipped for the manufacture, production, or mining" of any products whatsoever.

14. That the Attorney General was in error when he stated that the President is in possession of an "aggregate of powers" which "are derived from the Constitution and from various statutes enacted by Congress," which would empower him to take possession of the Chicago facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. The Attorney General did not cite any specific provisions of the Constitution. He did not cite any specific provisions of the acts of Congress which he mentioned. The acts of Congress which he did mention have no bearing on the labor dispute, because they deal with mobilization of industry, price control, and wage stabilization.

15. That the Secretary of Commerce called upon the United States Army to aid him in taking possession and control of the Chicago facilities of Montgomery Ward & Co. under his apparent authority. Such a step should have been taken only as a last resort. That it was not the last resort is shown by the fact that on April 27, 1944, the Government instituted proceedings in the Federal district court at Chicago, Ill., seeking a temporary restraining order and a mandatory injunction to compel company officials to comply with the Executive order.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN BIROBIDJAN COMMITTEE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, on May 16, 1944, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the establishment of the Jewish Autonomous Region, Birobidjan, in the U. S. S. R., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MONTGOMERY WARD CASE AND THE CONSTITUTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MOORE

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Montgomery Ward Case and the Constitution," delivered by him on May 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW SHALL WE PAY FOR THE PEACE?— ADDRESS BY SENATOR WEEKS

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "How Shall We Pay for the Peace?," delivered by Senator WEEKS at Boston on May 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMARKS OF HON. JAMES F. BYRNES ON PRESENTATION OF CHURCHMAN'S AWARD TO BERNARD M. BARUCH

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, at the one hundred and fortieth anniversary dinner of The Churchman, New York, May 23, 1944, on the occasion of the presentation of the Churchmans Award to Bernard M. Baruch, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEAL BY PRESIDENT OF UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS, C. I. O., TO THE MEMBERS OF HIS UNION

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an appeal issued by R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, C. I. O., to the members of his union, as published in the Philadelphia Record of May 28, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESOLUTION OF PENNSYLVANIA DEMO- CRATIC STATE COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution entitled "Roosevelt Resolution adopted at the Democratic State committee meeting at Harrisburg, Wednesday, May 24, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREE SPEECH IN NEWARK, N. J.—EDI- TORIAL FROM NEWARK (N. J.) NEWS

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "See Here, Mr. Farley," published in the Newark (N. J.) Evening News of Monday, May 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, it is not often that I feel called upon to take issue with anything appearing in the Washington newspapers, because I clearly understand that all four of them are antiadministration and if we should attempt to respond to all their blasts at the administration or members of the administration it would take all the time of the Senate. But there appears in the Washington Times-Herald of today a news item to which I feel called upon to respond. This article is headed:

D. C. VOTE BILL SHAN'T PASS, VOWS BILBO

Following a momentary boost Saturday, prospects for home rule for Washington dimmed yesterday when Senator "The Man" BILBO, chairman of the Senate District Committee, vowed to use every "honorable" stumbling block at his command to kill the measure.

BILBO's blast followed a Senate subcommittee's favorable action Saturday in reporting out to the full District Committee a bill sponsored by Senator McCARRAN (D.), of Nevada.

CHARGES McCARRAN "RAN OUT"

The former Mississippi preacher reiterated previous assertions that the measure would permit the "alleys to outvote the avenues" and declared that McCARRAN had "run out of town to save his own skin" after offering the bill.

(McCARRAN, former head of the Senate District Committee, left for a 3-week visit to Nevada shortly after his subcommittee had given the suffrage measure the "green light.")

BILBO said he had not even thought the matter important enough to discuss with other members of the committee because "nobody is for it."

Principal support for the measure comes from "Communists and Negroes," "The Man" told the Times-Herald, in disregard of the fact that many of Washington's leading civic organizations are outspoken proponents of the measure and even assisted in formulating some of the provisions.

BILBO expressed confidence that the measure wouldn't come before the full Senate District Committee "until the snow flies" and intimated strongly that the committee's calendar might be too full even at that date to consider the proposal.

REITERATES MISSISSIPPI SPEECH

"I shall fight the bill with every honorable means at my command," he vowed. "It is a violation of the will, plan, and dream of the American founders of democracy"—almost the exact words he used in his now well-known "white supremacy" speech before the Mississippi Legislature—

And so on. I merely wish to say that it has been my experience with all the reporters for the Washington press that they are very fine ladies and gentlemen, and their reports have been universally fair in reporting any interview I may have had with any one of them. While we discussed many things off the record, I wish to say that they have been ladies and gentlemen in that they have not violated any confidences. But this article is so full of misrepresentations and is so untrue that, in justice to myself and others, I think I should take the floor to deny the concoctions of the mind which prepared the article.

Yesterday I had a telephone call from a lady representing the Times-Herald. I do not remember her name. It is immaterial, except that I should say that if she attempted to write a story on the basis of that telephone interview the Times-Herald should very promptly change her assignment and assign her to the job of writing fiction, because in writing novels and fiction one does not have to be confined to facts; one can let the imagination run wild. That being the case, I think this lady would be quite a success as a novelist, as a fiction writer.

In the first place, I did not say that the suffrage bill for the District should not pass. I am only 1 of 96 Members of this body, and I should be a pluperfect ass if I should make the statement that the bill should not pass. That is a lie out of the whole cloth. I can only interpose my objection to the suggestion that suffrage be given to the District.

I think I am speaking the wish and judgment of the majority of the good people of the District of Columbia when I say such a course would not be a wise one to pursue. A campaign was made just after the Civil War, in 1870, and the

affairs of the District were turned over to the people of the District in that year. After a trial of about 7 or 8 years, Congress was compelled to take the control of the District back from the people. Those who were responsible for control of the District in those days, when they had control of it, involved the District in such tremendous indebtedness, there was so much corruption charged, that Congress in self-defense had to take the government of the District back unto itself.

There is a famous story known as the "feather duster" story, to the effect that when Congress took back the control over the District it sent a truck to the headquarters of local control of District affairs for supplies, furniture, and so forth. A man was seen coming out of the building who had something under his coat. He was asked what it was, and he replied, "I thought I would come down and get my share of what was left of the District, but I found that the scoundrels did not leave anything in the District Building except one feather duster, and I am going to take that home with me." That is just a mild picture of the misgovernment which the District endured when it was turned over to the District people from 1870 to 1878.

Of course, things are not as they should be in the District, even with the Congress attempting to legislate for the District. But the Congress has been very liberal in its conduct of the affairs of the District of Columbia, by turning over the intricacies of the local government to the Commissioners, and in some cases they have done a very good job.

There are many things in the District which need attention. For instance, I find that there are several hundred policemen in the District, and none of them is under bond. They are at liberty to do as they please with citizens. They can commit any kind of atrocity against a citizen, and there is no bond making possible compensation for any damage they might do to any citizen of the District, or anyone who happened to be in the Nation's Capital. Personally, I think that is a very grave mistake. I think every policeman of the District and of the Park Service should be under a substantial bond, so that if there were any wrongdoing on the part of these officials there would be some source from which an injured party could obtain compensation for whatever damage had been done. I am looking into that question, and I think it would be in keeping with the policies of other cities to have under bond these officers of the law, who are like the sheriffs in the three-thousand-odd counties in the States, who are under bond, as constables and deputies are under bond, so that there might be some means by which an offending officer would be compelled to compensate for any damage he might do.

I am not charging that the policemen of Washington have committed any crimes against citizens for which they should pay, but such a thing could happen. When they are not under bond, they feel free to go ahead and do what

they want to do to a private citizen in arresting him and incarcerating him, and it is a mistake not to have them under bond.

The article says that I stated that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] ran out of town in order to save his own skin on this proposition. That is the wildest statement I have ever seen in print. I would be the last man in the world to make such a statement about any of my colleagues. In fact, I talked with the Senator from Nevada Saturday, and I urged him to go home because he is a candidate for reelection, and it has been my experience that when a man is up for reelection the people of his own State expect him to come and give an account of his stewardship. He owes it to himself to go back and talk to his people about what he has done, when he is seeking reelection at their hands. No one could censure the Senator from Nevada for going home to look after his own reelection.

To say that he was thin-skinned would be ridiculous. He is anything else but a thin-skinned Senator. He is all Irish, and his skin would come nearer being of the rhinoceros type than being thin. He stands his ground, and I have very high regard for the Senator from Nevada. If it is his conviction that the District of Columbia should have the right of self-government, that is his business. It happens not to be my conviction.

One of the straws that helped to break the camel's back was when the reporter said that I stated that the committee would never have a chance until the snow flies to consider the bill. All I said to this reporter in that regard was that I would do everything honorable to defeat this ill-advised piece of legislation, and it certainly would not be honorable on my part, as chairman of the committee, to resort to any shenanigans or monkey business and not call the committee together to pass on any proposed legislation, whether I liked it or did not like it. So long as I am chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any other committee, I shall call meetings whenever I think it is proper, and there are proposals pending which I think should be considered. I shall resort to no monkey business to defeat proposed legislation to which I may be opposed. Such a thing never crossed my mind.

I may have said that the snow would fly before we finally got down to consideration of the bill, before it would be finally passed upon, because I do not know how long I shall talk when the bill comes up for discussion on the floor of the Senate, since I am very much opposed to such legislation. If the affairs of this District were turned over to the local people, knowing the population as I do, and the efforts which have been made to control the city government by the C. I. O. and the Negroes—I do not mind saying that, because they are all working together, it seems, not only in the District but in other parts of the country—I am afraid Congress would rue

the day it had released the control of the government of the District. Things are bad enough as they are; they would be worse then.

Another straw in the article that helped to break the camel's back was when the writer of the article dared to call me a preacher. I am not a preacher, and I have never been a preacher. That story is a newspaper lie from beginning to end. One of my colleagues suggests that I have never been a preacher, I am not now a preacher, and I never will be a preacher. I am not built that way. However, I preach sometimes, but I am not a preacher. I do not like having thrown at me the suggestion that I am a preacher when I am not. It is an attempt to be funny, to make me appear ridiculous; it is an attempt to make me appear what I am not, and I resent it very bitterly.

Mr. President, I repeat, I am opposed to the proposed legislation, but the committee will have every chance on earth to thrash it out, or any other legislation that comes before my committee, and when the bill reaches the floor of the Senate, if it has any support at all—I do not know that it has any—I will have much to say about it.

I might say at this point that the founding fathers knew what they were doing when they placed the government of this Federal City under the Congress because they were advised at that time of what had happened in all the great nations of the past when the governmental powers had been built up in the capital cities, such as in Rome under the Roman Empire. We do not speak of the Roman Empire; we rather speak of the Eternal City on the seven hills, where all the powers of the Roman Empire existed. That is where all the government was carried on, and from it all the power was obtained because Rome became all-powerful as a city. The same could be said with respect to Carthage and Athens and many other cities of the past. In the formation of the Government the founding fathers made provision in the Constitution that this city should be the place for the conduct of the business of the Federal Republic, and that the city should be under the exclusive control of the Congress of the United States. It has been under control of Congress for 150 years, with the exception of 8 years, when an excursion was taken into experimenting with local government, but after that experience it was found necessary to return to the Congress the government of the city, and I hope it will always remain the duty and responsibility of the Congress to look after the government of this great national city, which we hope to make the model city of the world.

Mr. President, I regret the necessity for having to refer to local newspaper write-ups, and I want to say again, based on my experience with them, that the reporters for the Washington newspapers, regardless of the attitude of their newspapers, are a very high-class and fine group of men and women, but here is one exception, and I want her to get

busy writing fiction because that is what she has done in this case.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 451 OF THE
TARIFF ACT OF 1930—CONFERENCE
REPORT

Mr. GERRY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 6, 7, 8, and 9 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "operator, or agent of a highway vehicle, bridge, tunnel, or ferry," and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "other means of highway travel upon, over, or through any highway, bridge, tunnel, or ferry"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "other means of highway travel upon, over, or through any highway, bridge, tunnel, or ferry, between the United States and Canada"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "or agent of any such highway vehicle, bridge, tunnel, or ferry, or other person"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be stricken out by the House amendment and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "over highways or toll bridges"; and the House agree to the same.

PETER GERRY,
A. H. VANDENBERG,
TOM CONNALLY,
ROBERT A. TAFT
(Per A. H. V.).

Managers on the part of the Senate.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JERE COOPER,
JOHN D. DINGELL,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the enrolled bill may be signed by the Acting President pro tempore during the recess of the Senate following today's session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A JUST AND LASTING PEACE IN THE
POST-WAR WORLD

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, recently I placed in the RECORD a number of letters from Methodists urging that the United States, in cooperation with other nations, take action to secure a just and lasting peace in the post-war world. I am now receiving letters from Baptists and members of other organizations along similar lines, including those who have signed the "pledge for peace" formulated by the organization of which Justice Owen L. Roberts, of the Supreme Court of the United States, is chairman.

Needless to say, Mr. President, I share with these individuals the ambition that the United States use its tremendous influence and powers to promote a just and lasting peace for all the world. I will do everything in my power to further that worthy objective. A few more world wars and I fear that what we have called our western civilization will be doomed. That must not happen.

I believe, furthermore, that the peoples of all the world desire peace for themselves and their neighbors in this world. Great Britain, Russia, China, the peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa, the islands that dot the seven seas are with the people of the United States in their desire for peace, in their ambitions to bring about conditions conducive to world peace.

But we also face the fact, Mr. President, that these nations and these peoples want their own kind of world peace.

Russia's idea of a just and lasting peace includes a rearrangement of boundaries and governments in eastern and central Europe—possibly even western Europe—that will insure Russia security in the peaceful world envisaged.

There is no doubt in my mind that the English idea of a just and lasting peace would include the preservation of the British Empire. Judging from what I have heard to date, France and Holland would not consider giving up any of their colonial empires to bring about a just and lasting peace. I hear talk among our own people of air bases overseas, for our own security after this war. China will ask, and be entitled to, assurance that she will be allowed to develop in her way the best interests of the Orient. I hear confusing reports from India as to Indian ideas of what would insure a just and lasting peace.

In other words, I feel that in common honesty I must say that I will work and sacrifice for a just and lasting peace with the full knowledge and appreciation of some of the difficulties we will face, and with a full realization that

there will be clashes of interest at the peace conference tables.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, following these remarks, a radio broadcast delivered by me by electrical transcription Sunday night, May 28, 1944, over Station WIBW, Topeka, Kans., on this subject, and also a few of the many letters and suggestions I have received in the past few days.

There being no objection, the address and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, in the past week or so I have received a number of communications from Baptists, outlining their views that two principles are basic to the establishment of a sound post-war world order.

Earlier in the year I received several thousand letters from Methodists, based on a circular to members of that church from the Boston bishops, outlining what should be told to Members of Congress to line them up for a new world order.

Only last Wednesday Winston Churchill, in a speech in the British House of Commons, outlined in a general way, some of his conceptions of how a just and fairly permanent peace may be attained by proper use of force in the post-war world.

A few days before that Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, at the New York Times Forum, came out vigorously in opposition to a post-war world ruled by a military alliance of three (perhaps four) great powers, and in favor of a council of United Nations rule.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull has spoken on the issue. He is working with some members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee toward a program for a permanently peaceful world, based on better relations among the nations of the world.

There are still some who are advocating a sort of United States of the World, though, as the time of settlement approaches, there seem to be fewer and fewer who believe this is possible.

Not much is heard in this country from Soviet Russia in the way of post-war world programs. But through actions rather than words Marshal Joseph Stalin has given the world to understand that Russia also wants a peaceful world, and intends to see to it that Russian influence in the Continent of Europe will not be subordinate to the influence of any other nation.

The Prime Ministers of Dominions of the British Commonwealth of Nations have been in session in London, laying plans for the preservation and possible enlargement of the sphere of influence the Commonwealth will play in whatever kind of world exists after World War No. 2.

The Baptist letters I have received nearly all read as follows, some with slight variations:

"It is my belief as a Christian citizen that the two principles I have stated below are basic in the establishment of sound post-war world order:

"1. I believe in a world organization in which every nation is invited to participate. A fellowship of nations limited to three or four strong powers—or even to all the United Nations—would lead inevitably to further conflict. Every nation, large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor, should be included. While the role of enemy nations would have to be limited at first, ultimately none should be left out. Only such inclusions would assure attainment of a just and lasting peace."

Still quoting from the Baptists' form letter:

"2. I believe in a world organization which will face realistically all problems that relate to human well-being. Such an organization should be designed not only to keep the peace (which is not enough) but shall provide for free discussion and orderly adjustments of international problems and disputes of all kinds with cooperative action and mutual assistance in solving problems of economic development, migration, finance, political sovereignty, religious liberty, and others so far as joint efforts may be effective. Anything short of this fails the fulfillment of the law of Christ to 'bear one another's burden' and would doom the nations to successive wars of increasing fury and devastation."

That, my friends, you will notice is a pretty broad and all-inclusive program to be worked out by all peoples of the world together. It is a worthy goal for which to steer our long-range course.

Now for the Methodists, who were asked to write their own ticket to their Congressmen, in line with the following suggestions from the bishops, under the title, "Your part in the crusade for a new world order." I quote from the Methodist program for getting the new world order:

"Why a crusade? To make sure that our own country will assume its share of responsibility for assuring peace in the future.

"While Congress has already taken definite steps toward world collaboration, this is not enough. We must go even further and do our part to assure the kind of world living that will change the conditions that give rise to war.

"That will have to be accomplished by our Government, by the administration, and by the Congress whose members are elected by the people. Therefore, it will have to be accomplished by the people.

"The first step is for you to write immediately to your representatives in both Houses of Congress. Say briefly in your own words on your own writing paper that you expect your representatives in Congress to support and vote for those measures that will enable our country to cooperate with the other nations of the world in constructive plans for the prevention of conditions that permit aggression and war.

"Say to them that you know the United States alone can neither prevent war nor keep war away from its own shore, once it has begun; therefore, it must cooperate with other nations, regardless of the expense involved to its citizens; that you are willing to make the personal sacrifices to insure peace * * *. Methodists, as followers of the Prince of Peace, are under divine imperative to use every means to establish a world order in which peace is possible."

I will say that the Methodists responded by the thousands. For a week or two my desk was loaded with their letters. They, too, have set up a worthy goal, toward which all of us are glad to work. Before commenting on these proposals, we might listen to a few words from Winston Churchill to the House of Commons, last Wednesday.

"We intend," said Mr. Churchill, speaking presumably also for the Dominion Prime Ministers, "to set up a world order and an organization equipped with all necessary attributes of power to prevent future wars or the planning of them in advance by restless and ambitious nations.

"For this purpose of preventing wars there must be a world-controlling council.

"There must be also a world assembly of powers whose relations to the world executive or controlling power for the purpose of maintaining peace I am in no position to define. To do so would be stepping outside the bounds which are proper to us and our allies."

Mr. Churchill warned against taking in too much territory by the few.

"As the head of the British Government or as a most respected institution in the grand alliance (note the use of grand alliance rather than United Nations by Mr. Churchill) "it would be a great mistake for me or the House to take it on ourselves to lay down the law for all these countries, including two great powers" (Russia and the United States, he means) "with whom we have to work if the world is to be brought back into a good condition."

In other words, Mr. Churchill lays down no blueprint for the post-war world. The first job is to beat the enemy, he told the House of Commons.

"The relations of three bodies and their relations with each other," Mr. Churchill said at another point in his address, "can only be settled after the formidable foes we are now facing have been beaten into complete submission.

"It would be presumption for any one power to try to prescribe in precise detail exactly what solution we found. Anyone can write down on paper at least a dozen large questions of this kind: Should there be a united force of nations, or should there be a world police force, and so on. It would be out of place for us to go beyond the gradual formulation of opinion and ideas which are constantly going on inside the British Commonwealth and in contact with our principal allies.

"We must undoubtedly in our world structure embody a great deal of all we have gained for the world by the structure and form of the League of Nations. We must arm our world organization and make sure within the limits assigned to it that it has overwhelming military power.

"We must remember," Mr. Churchill further warns, "that we shall all be hard put to it to gain a living, to repair the devastation which has been wrought. * * * We must strive to preserve the reasonable rights and liberties of the individual.

"There must be room in this great world organization for an organism like the British Empire of Commonwealths, and I trust there will be room also for a fraternal association of the British Commonwealth and the United States."

Such a fraternal association (alliance of Britain and the United States, I presume he means) according to Mr. Churchill would be a great aid in enabling the world organization to function.

There, my friends, you have some different views on and suggestions for peace in the post-war world; peace founded on military force and backed by a common understanding among some or among all of the peoples of the world—probably, if Mr. Churchill is right, among the leading nations.

Now a few words before my time is up. I am heart and soul with the Methodists and the Baptists and all others of our peace-loving people in their high and noble ambitions to obtain from this terrible war some assurance of a post-war world that will make for a just, a durable, a lasting peace. I will do everything possible to attain that end. They may count upon my support.

But I would be derelict in my duty to these people and to my country if I did not point out that the attainment of a just and lasting peace will depend upon more than just the United States and its representatives in peace conferences. There are others. They all want lasting peace—Britain, Russia, China, France, the Low Countries, all nations and peoples, I think.

But as I see it Russia's idea of a just and lasting peace includes rearrangements of boundaries and governments in Europe, at least, that will secure the power and prestige of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Britain's idea of a just and lasting peace includes retention and security of the British Empire. France wants her colonial empire

restored and guaranteed. China wants security, and so on.

And for myself, I cannot subscribe to any program that turns over to other nations, or a group of nations, the sovereignty of the United States in domestic affairs, or the sovereignty of the United States in the last analysis to determine its own foreign policies.

I will support a program of cooperation of the United States with other sovereign nations; I do not see that I can support a program that will make us a dominion in someone's empire—at least not until I know the terms upon which we are to be admitted to that world empire.

Of course, our actions will have to be guided by events and conditions as these present themselves. I think we can all agree on that. I would like to know what you think of this matter.

WORLD TRAVEL-STUDY CLUBS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1944.

MR. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Resident for years in Topeka, I have come to Washington for the present via Indiana. But I am writing to you because you represent the people of Kansas in their most vital interests.

The greatest issue of all time rests in our hands—that of formulating and maintaining a just and lasting peace.

We are looking to you, in your strategic position and influence, for setting up now a United Nations council to work out plans for permanent organization to safeguard all that we are fighting for.

Sincerely,
JOSEPHINE M. STEARNS
(Mrs. J. M. Stearns).

HOLTON, KANS., May 7, 1944.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is my belief as a Christian citizen that the two principles I have stated below are basic in the establishment of sound post-war world order:

I. I believe in a world organization in which every nation is invited to participate. A fellowship of nations limited to three or four strong powers—or even t all the United Nations—would lead inevitably to further conflict. Every nation, large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor, should be included. While the role of enemy nations would have to be limited at first, ultimately none should be left out. Only such inclusiveness would assure the attainment of a just and lasting peace.

II. I believe in a world organization which will face realistically all problems that relate to human well-being. Such an organization should be designed not only to keep the peace (which is not enough) but shall provide for free discussion and orderly adjustments of international problems and disputes of all kinds with cooperative action and mutual assistance in solving problems of economic development, migration, finance, political sovereignty, religious liberty, and others, so far as joint efforts may be effective. Anything short of this fails the fulfillment of the law of Christ to "bear one another's burdens," and would doom the nations to successive wars of increasing fury and devastation.

A. J. SEABOLD.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
May 15, 1944.

Mindful that I am a citizen of a great country created 160 years ago by the union of 13 divided and quarreling colonies, and convinced that the world of today holds as much wisdom as did that of the founding

fathers, I declare myself for these propositions:

1. That to save myself, my children, and my fellow-beings from inevitable destruction in future world wars, a world organization shall be formed;

2. That this world organization shall in the beginning consist of the United Nations and such neutral countries as may be admitted by them;

3. That the Axis Powers, their allies and their sympathizers, shall have the status of territories on probation until the world organization shall admit them to membership;

4. That no member nation may at any time or for any reason secede from the world organization;

5. That each member nation of the world organization shall give up forever the sovereign right to commit acts of war against other nations;

6. That the authority of the world organization shall be made effective and irresistible by the establishment of an international police force;

7. That a primary goal of the world organization shall be the gradual abolition of economic and political imperialism throughout the world; and

8. That it shall be the first duty of the world organization not merely to destroy the military power of the Germans and Japanese, but to formulate and carry into execution whatever measures may be deemed necessary to prevent them from preparing for a third world war of conquest.

Solemnly aware that the acceptance of these propositions involves the creation in myself of a loyalty to the human race along with, but not conflicting with, my loyalty to my own country, I do hereby set my hand and pledge the allegiance of my heart.

HENRY WERNER.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF
UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Chanute, Kans., May 18, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I want to add my voice to those in favor of an international organization of the United Nations. A foreign policy based on actual cooperation among the nations, such as the Connally resolution should, it seems to me, be forged into a working plan by the adoption of such a resolution and the establishment of the international machinery to carry it out.

It seems to me that it should not be postponed longer. It is foremost in our thinking and while we are working for a military victory would seem to be the appropriate time to work for this cooperation among nations. It is the only course that will succeed in permanently establishing peace among the nations and it is my hope that your efforts will be directed to that end.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. T. H. CRONMEYER,
State Chairman, Economic and Legal
Status of Women.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Osawatimie, Kans., May 7, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, with all American people and the people of the United Nations, are being called upon to put all of our efforts into waging war. We consider it a duty, forced upon us largely by bungling, unwise, and selfish leadership on the part of all the nations, but nevertheless a duty; therefore, we do our part.

We charge you as one who represents us and all Americans to stand firmly even if you have to stand alone, for a just peace. And by a just peace we mean a peace which will

come because of right relationships, fairness, unselfishness, good will among the peoples of all nations and races. Let the ideals of the various church pronouncements be taken seriously. Specifically, we mention the work of the Federal Council of Churches, the Delaware conference of March 1942, and the Six Pillars of Peace of March 1943. When we wage peace as assiduously as we have been waging war we can have peace.

We cherish your long public service, but the greatest service you can render America and humanity is to have a part in creating a warless family of nations. We trust you will measure up to this tremendous opportunity.

Cordially yours,

Taylor B. Light; C. E. Blauvelt; Mr. and Mrs. P. O. Edwards; Mr. and Mrs. E. H. Hawkins; Mrs. C. L. Carmichael; Mrs. S. O. Piggott; Mrs. H. L. Latimer; Mrs. E. E. Potter; Mrs. W. J. White; Mrs. E. P. Hawkins; Virginia Hawkins; Mrs. Dora Wilt; Mrs. W. H. Campbell; Mrs. Lawrence White; Mr. and Mrs. F. E. Weller; Mr. and Mrs. L. V. Clift; W. B. Sechert; V. E. Zumbun; Mrs. A. Elchorn; Mrs. Ruby M. Shover; Katie B. Shulls; Mrs. Mary Jones; Mrs. Esther Piggott; Mrs. W. F. Pryor; Mrs. D. B. Burks; Mrs. R. A. Pulliam; Mrs. V. E. Zumbun; Mrs. H. G. Crumpley; Mrs. E. E. Coleman; E. H. Hansen; Mr. and Mrs. E. C. Neff; H. L. Piggott; Mrs. B. Roberts; Mrs. John B. Lindemood; Hugh W. Campbell; Mrs. Taylor B. Light.

PALMER, KANS., April 16, 1944.

DEAR SIR: Our pastor asked each of us to write our opinions of the crusade for a new world. Of course we all want peace. We'd like to have lasting peace instead of another war in a few years. Personally, I think we must cooperate with other nations and that we must have a Christian attitude. That all countries should be treated equally. That one country (even ours) should not think themselves better than others. We should assume our share of the responsibility for assuring peace in the future, and cooperate with the other nations of the world in plans for the prevention of conditions that cause war. I'm sure each one of us would be willing to make sacrifices to insure peace. Most important of all, if we are to have peace we must have a Christian world and those at the peace table must act in a Christian way.

Yours truly,

Mrs. CLYDE CHAYER.

NORTH TOPEKA BAPTIST CHURCH,
Topeka, Kans., May 6, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was very much disappointed after World War No. 1 that our country did not become a member of the League of Nations. However, I think we are all more fully awake to the importance of plans for peace after this war.

I believe in a world organization in which every nation is invited to participate. If even our enemy nations are left out of the plan it will inevitably lead to further conflict in the years to come. Of necessity the participation of enemy nations must be limited at first, but to assure a just and lasting peace the organization must be inclusive.

I believe in a world organization which will deal with all problems that relate to human well-being. Such an organization should provide for freedom of discussion and adjustments on all international problems and disputes. These problems would include economic developments, immigration,

finance, international law, religious liberty, etc.

The reason I believe in Christian principles being used as a basis for world peace and order is because I believe Jesus Christ discovered and set forth basic and fundamental principles of life, individually and socially. If this is true we cannot hope to build a social world structure unless we use these principles as the foundation.

Very sincerely,

A. A. VAN SICKLE
(Mrs. A. A. Van Sickle).

PRATT, KANS., May 7, 1944.

Hon. Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Have watched your career for many years and admired your stand on many important issues. My parents, who have gone into the Great Beyond, have admired you as a Christian Senator and leader.

Your office will be flooded by many letters from Baptists. I too subscribe to the two principles which they advocate.

1. A world organization in which every nation is invited to participate.

2. A world organization which will face realistically all problems that relate to human well-being.

We know we can count on you.

Sincerely yours,

SARA BELLE WASSER,

HORTON, KANS., May 8, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Speaking as a Christian citizen, I would like to express myself as favoring a world organization as the only just and sound plan to insure peace after the present war has ended. I believe this world organization should include every nation large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor, even enemy nations. While limited at first perhaps, they should not be left out.

I believe this world organization should face and discuss freely all problems that relate to human well-being and it should settle international problems and disputes on economic development, migration, political sovereignty, and religious liberty. Anything short of such an organization will, in my opinion, fall short of ever accomplishing a post-war world acceptable unto the Lord Jesus Christ and we will again find ourselves involved in another world conflict.

Yours respectfully,

Mrs. W. R. HILL.

PRATT, KANS., May 10, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If we are to have a lasting peace we must begin now to formulate plans so that when the time comes we will know what we are striving to attain.

In order to secure a lasting peace I feel that it can only be done by applying Christian principles as a basis for the peace.

I believe in a world organization in which every nation is invited to participate. A fellowship of nations limited to three or four strong powers—or even to all the United Nations—would lead inevitably to further conflict. Every nation, large or small, should be included. While the role of enemy nations would have to be limited at first, ultimately none should be left out. Only such inclusiveness would assure the attainment of a just and lasting peace.

I believe in a world organization which will face realistically all problems that relate to human well-being. Such an organization should be designed not only to keep the peace (which is not enough) but should

provide for free discussion and orderly adjustment of international problems of economic development, migration, finance, political sovereignty, religious liberty, and others so far as joint efforts may be effective. If we fail to so federate, the world will be doomed to successive wars of increasing devastation.

We feel that you very sincerely strive to know the wishes of our constituency and we have never doubted your honesty and integrity. Long may you ably represent Kansas as you have so well done in the past.

Yours very truly,

MAUDE B. McBRIDE.

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES— CONFERENCE REPORT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of Thursday last the conference report on House bill 2928 is now before the Senate for consideration. The clerk will read the report.

The Chief Clerk read the report submitted by Senator McKELLAR on May 4, instant, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

At the end of said amendment, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and post-office inspectors, shall be on duty not less than forty-eight hours per week, and shall be paid for the additional eight hours, as additional pay for working such additional time, as follows:

"Those whose salaries are over \$5,000 and not over \$7,999, 5 per centum of their regular peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are over \$4,000 and not over \$5,000, 10 per centum of their regular peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are over \$2,000 and not over \$4,000, 15 per centum of their peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are \$2,000, or under, 20 per centum of their peacetime salaries: *Provided further*, That no postmaster whose peacetime compensation is \$8,000, or over, shall receive any additional compensation for such overtime work."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
JOSHUA W. BAILEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

T. G. BURCH,

TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE D. O'BRIEN,
FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
N. M. MASON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee if the minority members of the conference committee joined in the report?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir. The conference report is signed by the two

Democratic members. It is not signed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who represents the minority. There is only one difference between the minority member and the majority members, and the Senator from Kansas will now explain that, I suppose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I could have hoped that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had undertaken the difficult task of defending the report of the majority members of the conference committee rather than put the burden upon me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do it if the Senator wishes.

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. President, House bill 2928 was passed by the House of Representatives on July 5, 1943, and passed by the Senate in March. The bill had for its purposes the following:

"That when the needs of the service require postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, laborers, watchmen, and messengers, in first- and second-class post offices, and employees of the motor-vehicle and pneumatic-tube services, and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in the Village Delivery Service, and employees of the Railway Mail Service, post-office inspectors and clerks at division headquarters of the post-office inspectors, employees of the Stamped Envelope Agency and employees of the mail-equipment shops; cleaners, janitors, telephone operators, and elevator conductors, paid from appropriations of the First Assistant Postmaster General; employees of the Air Mail Service; Cost Ascertainment employees (until such time as they shall be transferred to the departmental roll); employees upon the field roll of the Division of Equipment and Supplies and all employees of the Custodial Service except charwomen and charmen and those working part time, to perform service on Saturday they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday on which the excess service was performed: *Provided*, That employees who are granted compensatory time on Saturday for work performed the preceding Sunday or the preceding holiday shall be given the benefits of this act on 1 day within 5 working days following the Saturday when such compensatory time was granted: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require it, authorize the payment of overtime for Saturdays in lieu of compensatory time, such overtime, however, to be payable only upon so much of the earned basic compensation as does not exceed \$2,900 per annum, any emoluments received pursuant to the act entitled 'An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service,' approved April 9, 1943, not to be considered as part of the earned basic compensation." In computing the overtime compensation the base pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one-third-hundred-and-sixth of the respective per annum salaries and the base pay for 1 hour shall be considered to be one-eighth of the base pay so computed for 1 day.

The bill as passed by the House and sent to the Senate was amended in the Senate, and there has been a conference. The conferees have unanimously agreed on everything except the provisions with reference to postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and

post-office inspectors. Only the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] disagrees on that point.

The situation is that it was thought that the salaries of those employees were sufficient. There was quite a controversy in the conference committee on that issue. A compromise amendment was finally reached, and I shall read it. I think it will commend itself to everyone as being entirely fair. Instead of having extra time allowed, the provision as to first- second- and third-class postmasters and post-office inspectors which was agreed upon is as follows:

Provided, That postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and post-office inspectors, shall be on duty not less than 43 hours per week, and shall be paid for the additional 8 hours, as additional pay for working such additional time, as follows:

Those whose salaries are over \$5,000 and not over \$7,999, 5 per cent of their regular peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are over \$4,000 and not over \$5,000, 10 per cent of their regular peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are over \$2,000 and not over \$4,000, 15 per cent of their peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are \$2,000, or under, 20 per cent of their peacetime salaries: *Provided further*, That no postmaster whose peacetime compensation is \$8,000, or over, shall receive any additional compensation for such overtime work.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, a majority of the conferees on the part of the Senate and all the conferees on the part of the House felt that the compromise was a reasonable one. I understand it is acceptable to those who are affected by it. The bill is one which should become law. It has been before the Congress for a long time. So far as I know, my good, genial friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is the only one who is opposed to this very moderate and modest compromise agreement as to these salaries. That is the only question.

The committee has directed me to report the bill from the conference and to ask the Senate to vote "aye" on the question of adopting the conference report. I sincerely hope that will be done.

I now yield to my friend the Senator from Kansas, who is on the other side of the issue, and who does not wish to have the conference report agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee might well have added, in explaining the compromise which he is offering, that the same sort of compromise was made with John L. Lewis and the coal miners, in an effort to justify an increase in pay which could not otherwise be justified.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know that was in issue. So far as I recall, it was not stated in the conference that the compromise was the same as the compromise with Mr. Lewis.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this is quite an important matter. The duty I am performing today is not a happy one. I prefer to agree with my associates. This is the first time I have come to the floor in opposition to a conference report. This is the first time I have ever raised any question about postal salaries. I served in the Post Office Department a long time; and certainly the last depart-

ment as to which I would raise any question would be the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, the conference report should be rejected. If the report is accepted, we shall by an act of Congress have broken the "hold the line order," disregarded the Little Steel formula, and raised salaries as much as 45 percent in the salary bracket around \$2,000. If the report is adopted, I am sure Judge Fred Vinson will be tremendously embarrassed in the future in trying to hold the line.

I do not know Judge Vinson very well. I have admired him for the persistency and consistency with which he has endeavored to carry out the instructions he has had under Executive order to hold the line. I still have the old-fashioned idea that by an act of Congress an Executive order to hold the line can be superseded. I am equally of the opinion that while Congress has the power to do so in this instance, it is not wise to exercise it.

Mr. President, let me rehearse the history of this legislation as briefly as I can.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. REED. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOWNEY. I simply wished to ask if the net result of the compromise agreement would be to give a postmaster with a peacetime salary of \$7,800 a greater overtime rate than that received by a postmaster whose peacetime salary is \$8,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot answer that question. I do not know that we have the facts. Perhaps the Senator from Kansas can give them. What the Senator says may be true, but, if so, it is true only in an unusual case. It was not the intention to bring about such a result.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to answer the question of the Senator from California if he will be good enough to repeat it.

Mr. DOWNEY. As I interpret the amendment suggested in the conference report, it would add a minimum of 5 percent to all peacetime salaries up to \$8,000.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. It would add nothing to salaries of \$8,000 or more.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. So the individual having a salary of \$7,800 or \$7,900 would be much better off, by several hundred dollars, than the man with a peacetime salary of \$8,000. For that reason I agree with the Senator that the subject ought to have further consideration.

Mr. REED. Let me go into the history of the legislation. This proposal has no place on the floor of the Senate at this time. I dislike to disagree with such eminent Senators as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I am sure the Senator from North Carolina would not object to my repeating what he told me in our last conversation,

that his position would be one of "confession and avoidance."

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator ever heard of my confessing and avoiding, I must have been under the spell of the Senator's eloquence.

Mr. REED. I said the Senator from North Carolina, not the Senator from Tennessee. I think the Senator from Tennessee is set in his ways, but he will have to bear the burden alone. I am sure he will find no enthusiasm on the part of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for the adoption of this report.

Let me give the history of this proposal. Two years ago the Postmaster General came to the Congress and asked for an amendment to a law then on the statute books. In asking for that amendment the Postmaster General said:

The amendment of such legislation would not increase the cost of postal service to the nation.

That was in a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House, which is a part of the record.

What are the facts? The facts are that the overtime pay in 1942, under the old law, was \$10,396,000. The overtime estimate for the fiscal year 1945 is \$69,777,200. These are official figures, furnished me by the Post Office Department, and brought to the attention of the conferees.

We were asked to amend the law in 1942 and did so, as the result of a request and a promise from the Postmaster General, who said that there would be no increase in the cost of the Postal Service. The increase in cost would amount to approximately \$60,000,000. I know we have reached a time when \$60,000,000 is not regarded as a very important item; and yet there is involved in this proposal the good faith of an administration pledge.

Of course, I would not wish to suggest any partisan element, but the fact remains that under this bill 16,907 postmasters, most of them Democrats, would receive an increase in salary. There would be an increase of 20 percent in the lowest brackets. The lowest salaried postmasters who would receive any benefits would be postmasters receiving \$1,200. They would receive an increase of 20 percent. The highest salaried postmasters who would receive any benefit would be those receiving \$7,900. They would receive an increase of 5 percent.

The Senator from Tennessee did not tell quite all the story. This bill, as it passed the House, carried overtime pay for postmasters. I hope the Senate will listen to this, because the country is listening to it. As it passed the House, the bill carried overtime pay for postmasters. Every Senator knows what postmasters are. Nearly all Senators—particularly those on the Democratic side—have had many postmasters appointed, and they know what postmasters are. They are executives. They are administrators. They are managers. I thoroughly believe in overtime pay for the rank and file of postal employees who work under supervision, who perform assigned duties,

and who can receive overtime pay only after certification by a superior. I challenge any Senator to point out any instance in which a manager, who is hired by the year to do a job, ever was paid for overtime. He regulates his own working hours. He arranges his own work. He puts in as few or as many hours as he chooses. Yet the bill as it came to the Senate proposed to give that class of officials overtime. I objected as vigorously as I knew how.

I am not raising the question of adequacy or inadequacy of postmasters' salaries. I say that the bill before us is the wrong way to go about adjusting salaries. When the Senate passed the bill it struck out overtime for first-, second-, and third-class postmasters. The House refused to accept the amendment and the bill went to conference.

Mr. President, the conferees finally came to agree with the premise—at least, I assume they did—that it was rather bad business to try to pay postmasters on an overtime basis. So the majority, in an effort to find a way out and still increase postmasters' salaries, concluded to give them a percentage increase in salary—20 percent in the lowest brackets, and 5 percent in the highest brackets, at \$7,900.

The other day I noticed in the press a criticism by the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in connection with the pressure from Government employees for increases in salaries. I do not wish to deny any Government employee the right of petition. I believe that a Government employee has the right, if he chooses, to write to his Member of Congress. In the instance to which I refer I believe some of the employees of the Office of Education were criticized. That agency is not alone in this respect.

Let me say to Senators that the postal employees are as well organized as are the railroad brotherhoods. Whenever a postal bill affecting wages and working conditions comes before us for consideration the committee room of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which is not very large anyway, can hardly hold the representatives of the postal employees' organizations. I find no fault with that. But the House has not seen anything yet.

Last fall it became known that I was objecting to the overtime provision. I have received 787 letters and telegrams from postmasters in every State of the Union urging me to support the increase in pay for postmasters. They do not care very much whether the increase is brought about through overtime pay or an increase in salary. What they want is the money.

I wish to call attention to one particular phase of this question. Among the reasons given for increasing the salaries of postmasters at this time is an increase in work, perhaps due partly to the war effort. Mr. President, it requires considerable gall for a group of men on the pay roll of the United States at reasonable salaries to ask for increased compensation because of increased work due to the war effort when tens of thousands of plain citizens up and down this land

are devoting from 10 percent to 100 percent of their time to the war effort without a cent of compensation of any kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, let me say that I believe in every department of the Government provision has been made for overtime payment. Nearly all the employees of the Government receive pay for overtime. We have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for overtime payments. The postal employees are the only ones who are not receiving any pay for overtime. I am wondering if the Senator is opposed to all overtime payments provided for in the bill. Provision is made for overtime payments to cleaners, janitors, telephone operators, and so forth. Does the Senator mean to say that he is opposed in principle to all overtime payments? If I correctly understand him he is opposed to the provision concerning postal inspectors, and the three upper classes of postmasters, but is in favor of overtime payments to those in the other categories set forth in the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, we can save a great deal of time if the Senator from Tennessee will allow me to point out to him that in the minority views, which he never read and to which he never paid the slightest attention, it is stated that the Senator who submitted the minority views has no objection to this bill except as it relates to postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then it is boiled down to them. The postmasters, Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I cannot yield to the Senator from Tennessee. He must make his speech in his own time.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will not yield to me, very well.

Mr. REED. I must remind the Senator from Tennessee that he may state what he wishes with regard to the majority report. All the minority views need is an explanation. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to wait and make his defense, if he has any, in his own time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no defense to make. I merely urge the Senate to adopt the conference report.

Mr. REED. I was sure the Senator from Tennessee would urge the adoption of the report. I had no doubt whatever about it.

Mr. President, by direction of the committee we made some investigation into the extravagance in the administration of the so-called overtime provision. The Post Office Department itself recognizes the fact that there has been waste and extravagance. On two different occasions the First Assistant Postmaster General sent out letters warning postmasters about this very thing, but without result. The Department is cognizant of the conditions which exist, but I do not believe it has made the vigorous effort to correct waste and extravagance which the importance of the subject requires.

Who is responsible for the waste and extravagance? Only one class of employees; namely, the postmasters. That

fact is recognized by everyone familiar with the Postal Service, including the present officers of the Post Office Department downtown. Yet the postmasters, who are largely responsible for the approximately \$60,000,000 waste, are to be rewarded—not penalized, removed, or disciplined—by an increase in salary. Those very men—1,000, or perhaps 5,000—ought to be removed from office for negligence, waste, extravagance, and maladministration. It is now proposed by the majority report that they be rewarded for their lack of competence, efficiency, good faith, and care in administration.

Mr. President, there is so much to be said along this line that I am tempted to take more time than I feel I should take.

I wish to reiterate that a proposal is being made to reward men in public office who have been inefficient, wasteful, extravagant, and neglectful. An effort is being made to increase their compensation partly on account of war work. They are on the Government pay roll drawing salaries ranging from \$1,200 to \$12,000. It is proposed to reward them for war work, if you please, while tens of thousands of citizens of this country are devoting as much time to war work as any postmaster, and in many instances more time, without compensation of any kind.

Mr. President, I do not find pleasure in my opposition to the adoption of the conference report, but I think it should be rejected.

Mr. REED subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the minority views at the close of my remarks. The majority report, was substantially read into the RECORD by the Senator from Tennessee. I would like to include the minority views.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY STATEMENT RELATING TO CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 2928

It is always pleasant to agree with one's associates. May I say in the beginning that this is the first time I have failed to sign a conference report. There are compelling reasons why I do not feel able to do so in this instance.

I regret that my first inability to agree with my associate conferees arises with a bill affecting compensation of postal employees. I served the Post Office Department many years and naturally have a most sympathetic approach to the interests of all postal employees. The reasons which impel my dissent in this case transcend any sentimental attitude toward my past associates.

Consideration of H. R. 2928 by the conferees naturally fell under two headings. The first was overtime; the second was the question of salaries for postmasters.

THE THEORY OF OVERTIME

House bill 2928 was primarily a bill to provide overtime payment for various classes of postal employees, including postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and post-office inspectors. As the bill was passed by the House, it provided overtime for these officials. The Senate amended the bill by striking out overtime payment for postmasters and post-office inspectors. The House refused to concur in the Senate amendment and sent the bill to conference.

I find no fault with a rule that provides compensation based upon hours worked. Such a rule is universal throughout all kinds of business. Once a workweek of a reasonable period is determined as a base, additional time obviously should be paid for.

The fact that provision is made for overtime pay argues a varying period of labor from day to day or week to week on the part of the person who receives the added pay. The established workweek period in the Postal Service is 40 hours, and the fact that overtime payment is provided for service in excess of 40 hours is definitely not to be taken as extending all workweeks to 48 hours. The Post Office Department has emphasized that fact from time to time and has undertaken to restrict overtime payments to such additional hours above 40 as may be found necessary to transact postal business.

It logically follows that the determination of the hours above 40 hours per week to be worked and paid for must be determined by some authority above the person actually performing the work and claiming overtime pay. In the second part of this expression, I shall criticize the Post Office Department, to some extent, for the lack of vigorous administration. But with the principle itself I have no quarrel. If this rule is sound, and I think it is, a man working overtime does not himself determine the extent of the work necessary for which extra pay is to be received.

The Postal Service is made up of some thousands of post offices scattered over the country. Overtime payments are made only in post offices of the first, second, and third classes. There are some 16,907 of these. A postmaster, whose compensation is fixed by law and based entirely upon the volume of business done in second- and third-class offices, and to some extent in offices of the first class, is the agent of the Post Office Department in his particular office and responsible to the Post Office Department for the administration of that office. In other words, he is the executive supervising and directing the work of his office. He is the person who has been designated by the Department to determine the necessity for work above 40 hours per week for the assistant postmaster, clerks, carriers, and other employees of his office. The fact that, to a great extent, postmasters have been derelict in the administration of this duty does not lessen their responsibility.

The postmaster not only determines the time necessary for the various employees of his office to work, but, of course, he determines the application of his own labor. The payment of overtime for employees who work under direction, and according to direction, is universal throughout the business world. Nowhere, so far as I have ever heard, is overtime paid to a man who calculates and computes his own hours of labor. That is a sound common-sense business rule. Such men are usually called executives or administrators. Postmasters are either or may be both.

There are good, bad, and indifferent postmasters. In my experience I have met hundreds, perhaps thousands of them, and have carried on much official correspondence with them. They average about the same in ability and experience and honesty as does the human race, generally speaking.

To place upon the postmaster the responsibility of determining, not only the overtime necessary for those post-office employees under his supervision, but add to that responsibility the duty of computing his own overtime, which would be the basis of extra pay for him, is neither fair to the postmaster nor to the public service of which he is a part. For some months, it has been reported through the various postmaster organizations that I was the "villain of the piece"; that is, the Senator principally responsible for raising some question about the sound-

ness of the policy involved. I have had several hundred letters and telegrams from postmasters all over the country asserting their honesty, integrity, and patriotism. I have questioned none of these things. I have consistently asserted that it is not good practice in either public or private business to place any individual in the position of determining his own pay, based upon a varying number of hours of work he devotes to his job.

I do declare that a substantial majority of postmasters have not carried out the spirit of the law, nor the instructions of the Post Office Department with regard to the overtime provision contained in Public, No. 509 (H. R. 6759). I shall deal with this more extensively later.

In the consideration of this bill in the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee of the Senate, in the first instance, I took this position and the committee finally concluded to amend the bill, omitting first-, second-, and third-class postmasters from the benefits of overtime payments. I would not undertake to say that all members of the conference accepted this view as necessarily correct, but at least the conferees concluded to drop the idea of paying overtime to postmasters. They handled the pay factor in a different way. I fear that the conferees' method of handling this item is, perhaps, more dangerous, from a standpoint of sound public policy, than the original plan to pay overtime.

HOW OVERTIME WORKS

Relatively little overtime in the Postal Establishment was paid prior to the passage of Public Law No. 509 (H. R. 6759), approved March 27, 1942. The workweek of postal employees was fixed at 40 hours. Generally speaking, half holidays on Saturday were granted in first-class post offices and most second-class offices. If the necessary work on Saturday required any employee to work more than 40 hours for that week, he was granted compensatory time off in the following week. (This rule of compensatory time did not apply on the three Saturdays preceding Christmas. Straight overtime could be and was paid for extra Saturday work in that period.)

To meet the unsettlement caused by the breaking out of the war, the Postmaster General, on March 9, 1942, addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House asking that the law be amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require it, authorize the payment of overtime for Saturdays in lieu of compensatory time."

This authority was construed to apply to assistant postmasters, clerks, and carriers. Postmasters and post-office inspectors were not included and received no overtime payment by virtue of this amendment. That omission is principally the cause of the bill now before us, although the provisions of the bill we are considering goes to other classes of employees, more or less limited in number. I have no objection to the bill so far as these other employees are concerned.

In his letter asking for the passage of H. R. 6759, the Postmaster General said:

"By virtue of the law, most postal field employees, approximately 270,000, may not be compelled to work on a Saturday unless they receive the same amount of time off on some day during the following week. This is 'compensatory time.'"

"The amendment of such legislation . . . would not increase the cost of postal service to the Nation, since the Saturday-employee replacement cost is practically as great, if not greater."

I have quoted from the letter of the Postmaster General to the Speaker of the House. If his words carry the only meaning which I can read out of them, the actual result is far from the estimate of the results by the

Postmaster General. I am advised by the First Assistant Postmaster General that overtime payments and estimates in post offices are as stated below:

Fiscal years:

1942	\$10,396,420
1943	61,003,199
1944	67,557,000
1945 (estimate)	69,777,200

* This figure includes some payments made under S. J. Res. 170. I do not have a basis for separating this sum, but it is relatively unimportant.

These are most astonishing figures. Overtime payments, through the fiscal year 1942, were at the rate of some \$10,000,000. In asking for the passage of H. R. 6759, the Postmaster General said the change "would not increase the cost of postal service to the Nation." Surely the increase of expenditures from \$10,000,000 to \$67,000,000 in 1944, and an estimate of nearly \$70,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945 calls for a complete explanation before further legislation on this subject is passed.

When H. R. 2928 was before the Senate Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, I raised the question of how the result flowing from the passage of H. R. 6759 compared with the expressed views of the Postmaster General. As the result the bill was referred to a subcommittee, of which Senator HAYDEN, of Arizona, was chairman. The subcommittee authorized me to investigate with the Post Office Department and obtain the best information available on this point. I have done so. I wish to say here that I found the office of the First Assistant Postmaster General most cooperative and helpful. It has been candid and has gone to much trouble to obtain information which was desired for this purpose. I find that from the very beginning of this more liberal overtime-payment rule, the Department has had difficulty in checking waste and extravagance in the various post offices throughout the country. From time to time the First Assistant Postmaster General has issued instructions and has cautioned postmasters about the administration of this more liberal overtime rule. I have been furnished with copies of letters issued to this end. In May 1943 the First Assistant Postmaster General said:

"In those postal units where a 48-hour workweek is not necessary, there may be authorized such hours in excess of 40 per week as the needs of the Service require. Under no circumstances may increased postal facilities of any kind be authorized in any branch of the Service merely for the purpose of establishing or continuing a workweek in excess of 40 hours."

The results obtained from this warning to postmasters were not satisfactory. On December 8, 1943, the First Assistant Postmaster General issued another letter. (This was after the Senate committee had called this subject to the attention of the Department.)

"Gross receipts and expenditures for auxiliary hire and overtime, for the September 1943 quarter indicates that some post offices are using more overtime for clerks, carriers, and laborers than is absolutely necessary, and that some offices have increased the hours of these employees to 48 hours a week, whereas previous estimates showed that satisfactory service was being rendered by the use of approximately 44 hours a week. Furthermore, it also appears in numerous instances that supervisors are being paid for overtime on Saturday when they formerly were able to take compensatory time the following week without additional cost to the Department."

"From our study of the estimates and expenditures submitted by postmasters, it is concluded that there is a possibility that the use of overtime is being abused. The percentage of clerical and carrier costs to the gross receipts has increased at many offices."

"The employment of regular employees on a 48-hour-week basis should have resulted in savings in expenditures for auxiliary assistance."

In order to obtain definite information on this point, I asked, on behalf of the subcommittee, that the First Assistant Postmaster General make an inquiry at a number of post offices throughout the country. A comparison was made between the overtime expenditure necessary under the compensatory time rule for the quarter ending March 31, 1942 (the last quarter of operation on the compensatory time basis) and overtime paid regular employees during the quarter ending September 30, 1943. (This was the last full quarter for which figures could be obtained preceding the inquiry.)

The results were startling. Expressed in hours of overtime, overtime service had increased as follows:

Selected second-class post offices

Salary of postmaster	Number of post offices	Total number of auxiliary hours used during quarter in granting compensatory time to regulars incident to Saturday service, quarter ending Mar. 31, 1942	Total number of hours overtime paid regular employees for service on Saturday during quarter ending Sept. 30, 1943	Percentage column 4 is of column 3
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
\$3,000----	41	9,470	26,095	275.55
\$2,900----	26	6,716	14,076	209.58
\$2,800----	30	5,515	12,231	221.77
\$2,700----	27	3,672	10,341	281.61
\$2,600----	32	5,489	9,720	177.08
\$2,500----	30	4,020	6,401	159.22
\$2,400----	39	2,609	5,089	195.05
Total..	225	37,491	83,953	223.90

This information will give the Senate some understanding of the reason for the issuance by the First Assistant Postmaster General of his warning on December 8, 1943, in which he said that more overtime was being used than "is absolutely necessary" and "there is a possibility that the use of overtime is being abused."

The First Assistant Postmaster General was extremely moderate in his statement that "there is a possibility that the use of overtime is being abused." The reports definitely show that the use of overtime is being abused, and outrageously being abused. The expenditures for overtime in the current fiscal year are stated as \$67,557,000 as against \$10,396,420 in 1942. The estimate for overtime for the next fiscal year is \$69,777,200. These are most extraordinary increases. If these increases are due to faulty administration, either in the Department or in the thousands of post offices throughout the country, surely the amounts involved are of sufficient importance to warrant the making of a conclusive investigation without delay.

I call special attention to the statement of the First Assistant Postmaster General in his letter of December 8, 1943:

"The employment of regular employees on a 48-hour-week basis should have resulted in savings in expenditures for auxiliary assistance."

The First Assistant Postmaster General was badly and sadly mistaken in his assumption, or he overestimated the competency of the postmasters administering the thousands of post offices in the country.

In the attempt to find the facts in this situation, the First Assistant Postmaster General sent out two sets of questionnaires. The first questionnaire was sent to 10 representative post offices in each State amounting to between 400 and 500 offices. Selection of post offices was made by the Post Office Department. The returns on this

questionnaire were not very satisfactory. The questionnaire itself was cumbersome and did not clearly get the information desired. I take a share of responsibility for this failure because this form was prepared after consultation between representatives of the First Assistant Postmaster General's office and myself.

A second questionnaire was sent out to 225 post offices. The second questionnaire was condensed and secured the precise information desired. It was prepared by the office of the First Assistant Postmaster General, which profited by the first unsatisfactory attempt to secure this information.

I have personally examined the returns from both the first and second questionnaires. I have both in my possession now. From this examination, it is apparent that about 75 percent of the postmasters, to whom these questionnaires were sent, had made no effort whatever to hold the overtime down to actual necessities of the Postal Service.

On the contrary, it is apparent that in something like 75 percent of the cases the passage of H. R. 6759 was taken as a license to increase the pay for virtually all clerks and carriers, including the assistant postmaster, to the full extent of 8 hours overtime per week. In a quarter there are 13 Saturdays. Questionnaire after questionnaire returned shows the assistant postmaster claiming and being paid for 104 hours of overtime in that quarter, which is the maximum possible hours. Somewhat comparable increases of overtime were given to clerks and carriers.

Returns from the 225 second-class offices tabulated above show that 37,941 extra hours were used and paid for during the quarter ending March 31, 1942. The same offices used 83,953 hours in the quarter ending September 30, 1943. During the second period 223.9 percent of overtime hours were used and paid for as compared with the quarter in the previous year.

This is an outrageous and inexcusable failure on the part of postmasters. For example:

One Ohio postmaster, with a salary of \$3,000, in a town of around 5,000 population, covered his situation with 624 hours of "compensatory time" in 1942 with no "overtime" actually paid for. His gross business actually decreased from 1942 to 1943. He used no "compensatory time" in the 1943 quarter, but 858 hours of "overtime" were actually paid for. The operating cost of salaries for himself, assistant postmaster, and his clerks and carriers increased from 63.4 percent of his gross revenue in 1942 to 87.1 percent in 1943. The increase, stated in money, is the difference between \$6,584.79 paid for salaries in the 1942 quarter and \$3,346.99 paid for salaries in the 1943 quarter. This is an increase of \$1,762.20 for this one office in one quarter. In a year this rate would increase salaries in this office more than \$7,000. I think there are other factors involved in this increase, but at that, gross extravagance is shown in this post office. On the face of this report this postmaster should be removed.

This increase in expenditure was in the face of an actual decrease in gross business.

This is the worst case I found. However, it is not the only case. Many other cases were bad—some of them nearly as bad as this.

The return of these questionnaires showed that only a minority of the postmasters handled their business in a satisfactory way. The postmasters making unsatisfactory reports are greatly in the majority.

From expressions of the First Assistant Postmaster General, this tremendous increase in cost must be attributed to a lack of proper supervision and careful administration by postmasters of the several thousand post offices affected. This is a situation that calls for immediate and thorough investigation by the Postmaster General. Failing such immediate investigation and remedy of this extravagance and waste, the

Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads should take cognizance of this whole situation and institute an inquiry.

To obtain these facts, expressed in figures, required a considerable amount of work on the part of the Post Office Department, as well as myself. I tried to bring the results to the attention of the conferees. I found that we are primarily legislators, who find it difficult to give the time and effort necessary to examine and understand a situation such as this.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES "BONUS"

Before reaching the question of postmasters' salaries, it is necessary to consider the effect of the operation of Public Law 25 (H. R. 1366), approved April 9, 1943. This passed the House of Representatives on March 15, 1943. (The debate will be found on pp. 2035 to 2047, inclusive, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

In opening the debate, Mr. BURCH of Virginia, chairman of the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, said:

"The increase which this bill provides conforms to the Little Steel formula. The average salary paid postal employees is about \$2,000 per annum. The average salary paid R. F. D. carriers is between \$2,000 and \$2,100 per annum. . . . Something has been said about the cost of this bill. I state to you gentlemen here and now that this bill is worked out so that it practically conforms to the Little Steel formula."

House bill 1366 provided a payment of \$300 per annum, for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, to all officers and employees of the Post Office Department in the field services, who were paid on an annual-salary basis. For employees on a piece-work or hourly basis, an increase of 15 percent in their compensation was provided. The clerk-hire allowance for third-class postmasters was increased 15 percent. Provision was made that in no case the increase in compensation or allowance should exceed \$300 per annum.

This bill was a recognition of the increase in living costs during the war period and applied to all officers and employees alike. The increase in cost of living is substantially as great to the lowest-paid employee as to the highest-paid official. The passage of this bill was almost unanimous in the House and was unanimous in the Senate.

Chairman BURCH of Virginia estimated that the effect of this bill would be to increase Postal Service operating costs \$38,688,000. The latest estimate, furnished me by the Post Office Department, states the increase in cost, due to this law, as \$93,927,268 for the fiscal year 1944, and \$95,031,687 for the fiscal year 1945. I think that action of the Congress in this regard was only a fair provision for increased living costs of postal officers and employees.

POSTMASTERS' SALARIES

We now come to the question of postmasters' salaries. I asked the First Assistant Postmaster General to give me an estimate of the effect of the proposal by the majority of the conferees on postal expenses. This is stated as follows:

Increase over present salary	
\$1,100 to \$2,000, 20 percent.....	\$2,885,800
Over \$2,000 to \$4,000, 15 percent..	3,038,100
Over \$4,000 to \$5,000, 10 percent..	59,210
Over \$5,000 to under \$7,980, 5 percent	29,100
Total.....	6,012,210

No increase in salary of postmasters is authorized where the salary is \$8,000 per annum or above.

I do not doubt the authority of Congress to increase the salaries of postmasters if it so desires. I most emphatically question the

wisdom of doing so under all the circumstances. I shall discuss these circumstances.

Generally, the reasons given for increasing compensation to postmasters may be stated as:

A. Increase in their work and responsibilities.

B. Increase in living costs.

C. To some extent, increases in compensation, through payment of overtime, have raised the pay of assistant postmasters and clerks to a higher figure than the salary of the postmaster.

It may be fairly said that, probably, the latter factor has been urged more vigorously by postmasters than any other. I shall discuss these in the order stated.

A. There is no doubt that the work of postmasters has been increased through the addition of nonpostal activities that are being carried on through post offices for the war effort. This is an indeterminate factor, and it is exceedingly hard to appraise its weight and effect. In dealing with this factor it should be recognized that in every community draft boards, rationing boards, and various other boards and committees are functioning in connection with the war effort. Largely, the work of these boards is being carried on by citizens volunteering to serve without compensation. Every Member of Congress has personal knowledge of these boards and their personnel. In many instances the work of these boards takes a substantial part of the time of a citizen who serves without compensation.

I do not think that the average burden imposed upon the postmaster, because of additional nonpostal activities, is any greater than the average duties carried by citizens of his community without compensation. If the Congress is going to increase postmasters' salaries because of this factor, it ought to make provision for every other citizen serving on draft boards, rationing boards, war boards, U. S. O., O. C. D., Red Cross, and a myriad of like activities. Certainly, in this proposal we are discriminating against a multitude of our fellow citizens who give their time to the war effort without any form of money compensation.

B. When we come to the second factor, increase in living costs, it should be recognized that the bonus of \$300 per annum allowed to every officer and employee of the Postal Service was intended to take care of this factor. Surely, we are not going to start to make exceptions of postmasters and accord them special treatment.

In this connection, it might be remembered that there is such a thing as a "hold the line" Executive order. That order is based upon the increase in living costs which have occurred since January 1, 1941. The Little Steel formula holds all wage and salary increases to a 15-percent basis.

There is a further factor in this dimension. Employers in private business are not allowed to raise salaries or wages of their employees without permission from the War Labor Board. This rule applies to individuals as well as groups. It has been the cause of much embarrassment to many employers. It is true that the War Labor Board grants permission to raise wages and salaries where justification is shown. Such permission is usually granted to meet the stern necessities of employers in their effort to retain employees as against the higher wages offered in war industries. Permission is also granted by the War Labor Board to correct gross inequities.

There is nothing in the record to indicate that postmasters are entitled to be placed in either of these classifications. If the Congress comes along and increases the salaries of postmasters, principally upon the basis that they want the money, it may be more difficult for the War Labor Board and the Economic Stabilization Director to hold the line.

Personally, I can conceive of no circumstance in the present situation that justifies the Congress in making postmasters a preferred class as against the very numerous classes of citizens who do not share the joys of public office. With all respect for my colleagues of the conference committee, I think they are treading on dangerous ground in what they propose to do in this instance.

C. We all have had pressure from the highly organized employees of the Post Office Department, both individually and through their organizations. Because of my peculiar relation to this question, I think it possible that I have had much more pressure, particularly from individual postmasters and postmaster organizations, than have my colleagues. Much is made of the claim that the assistant postmaster and other subordinates are now receiving higher compensation than the postmaster himself.

This is true to some extent, but the facts are grossly exaggerated. Senator HAYDEN, from the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, carried on an inquiry with the Post Office Department covering this phase. His report was printed as Report No. 788, Calendar No. 795, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. I commend my colleagues of the conference to a careful reading of that report. It was found that there were some cases of the kind—mainly in second-class offices. Even in those cases, the excess of salary for the assistant postmaster, or any clerk, over the postmaster's salary, was insignificant. About 90 percent of the pressure exerted to secure my agreement to including overtime for postmasters in H. R. 2928 was because of this detail.

There is another factor to be considered. Any excess of compensation for subordinates, above the postmaster's compensation, is due in every case to the payment of overtime. This overtime payment could not be made except by the approval of the postmaster. It, perhaps, would not be accurate to say that postmasters approved these overtime payments for their subordinates in the post office for the purpose of making a prima facie showing for an increase in salary for themselves. But at least it had that effect and postmasters have certainly pressed, at least with me, that factor to the utmost limit.

However, I want to go to the broader question of the responsibility of postmasters to the Post Office Department, and to the public, in their capacity as the executives administering these thousands of post offices scattered all over the land. Without doubt or hesitation, I state that:

"They have grossly failed to discharge this responsibility. No person with any degree of understanding can consider the information furnished by the First Assistant Postmaster General and read his statement that 'the use of overtime is being abused,' without realizing that here is an important matter entitled to serious and immediate consideration in the public interest. Whatever of abuse and extravagance appears in the administration of this overtime authority is directly chargeable to the postmasters."

We now come to the astounding proposal to reward public officers who have been negligent and derelict in their duty with an increase in salary. It is hard to conceive anything more absurd than this proposition. The waste of public money is indicated, on the reports available, at around \$60,000,000 annually. These reports are not as comprehensive as I wish they were. It is entirely possible that reasons other than overtime may be found for a part of this expenditure. I think it is likely that such is the case.

However, no matter what offsetting factor may be found, that will not change the fact that negligence or incompetency of postmasters is causing a needless expenditure of public money to be measured in the scores of

millions of dollars. Whether that be twenty million, or forty million, or sixty million, is important but not the only important point. The most important thing is that public officers, who have failed in their duty, should be punished and not rewarded.

It is my belief that an immediate and thorough investigation of all the factors discussed herein should be instituted by the Postmaster General and carried through to as early a conclusion as possible. It is my further belief that, pending the result of such an investigation, this legislation should be held in abeyance. It is my quite definite belief that a thorough investigation by the Postmaster General will find negligence and incompetency to an extent that will justify the removal of hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of postmasters now holding office. That they should be rewarded for negligence is, to me, fantastic.

POST-OFFICE INSPECTORS

I served many years in the Post Office Department. I was always in the transportation end of postal work, but over the years I had full and complete opportunities to witness the work of post-office inspectors.

The post-office inspectors are as fine a body of public servants as can be found anywhere. To me they compare favorably with the F. B. I., Secret Service of the Treasury Department, the Intelligence Division of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and other similar organizations. They are most highly trained, competent, and earnest men. To consider, for a moment, placing a group of men like this on a basis of punching a clock when they go on duty and come off duty, and paying them overtime is ridiculous, and tends to lower the respect in which this body of men is held by their associates in the Postal Service and by the public generally.

If the post-office inspectors are not paid adequate salaries, I stand ready to vote for an increase in their salaries whenever a proper foundation is provided. I feel, very strongly, that an injustice is being done to the postal inspectors, as a body, and to the postal inspection service, by the proposal here considered. It cheapens them and lowers their prestige in discharging their duties—which is important.

CONCLUSION

Out of a long life of much experience with public service, both National and State, I want to say that I believe the Post Office Department of the United States of America is as efficient a functioning public agency as can be found anywhere in any land. To me, it is easily superior, as a business organization, to any other department of the Government. Nothing that I have said herein is to be taken as indicating any serious impairment of efficiency in the Post Office Department. I do think the Department is open to criticism for lack of vigorous administration upon this particular point. That doesn't lessen the esteem and respect which I hold for the responsible officers of the Post Office Department, nor the admiration I have for the service rendered by the vast body of postal employees.

What I am trying to do is make the Post Office Department more efficient; to reward competency, and to punish and discourage incompetency and waste. This is my only purpose.

CLYDE M. REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Reed
Austin	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffy	Reynolds
Billbo	Hatch	Robertson
Bridges	Hayden	Russell
Burton	Holman	Shipstead
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrd	Kilgore	Taft
Capper	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Cordon	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murdoch	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	Overton	
Gerry	Radcliffe	

Mr. McKELLAR. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays have been requested on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 2928.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on this question, will not some one tell us exactly to whom it applies?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; to first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, and post-office inspectors.

Mr. AIKEN. I refer to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, the bill applies to all postal employees. I thought the Senator was asking whether or not the opposition of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] applied only to postmasters.

Mr. AIKEN. Is any provision made in the bill for fourth-class postmasters?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. AIKEN. What happens to them?

Mr. McKELLAR. They get an increase for overtime.

Mr. AIKEN. Do they get an increase, and if so, how much?

Mr. McKELLAR. About 20 percent.

Mr. REED. The fourth-class postmasters, and all others working on an hourly or commission basis, get 15 percent already, they are now receiving it. So far as fourth-class postmasters are concerned, the bill does not include them in any way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me read.

Mr. REED. The controversy is over salaries of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters.

Mr. HOLMAN. And no one else?

Mr. REED. No one else.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator from Tennessee permit a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am somewhat confused, as other Senators are, as to the extent of the personnel of the Post Office Department covered by the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read the pertinent provision while the Senator from Oregon was out of the Chamber. Quite a large number are affected, and I shall be happy to read the list again.

The bill as it passed the House applied to "postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, supervisory employees, special clerks, clerks, laborers, watchmen, and messengers, in first- and second-class post offices, and employees of the motor-vehicle and pneumatic-tube services, and carriers in the City Delivery Service and in the Village Delivery Service, and employees of the Railway Mail Service, post-office inspectors and clerks at division headquarters of the post-office inspectors, employees of the Stamped Envelope Agency and employees of the mail equipment shops; cleaners, janitors, telephone operators, and elevator conductors, paid from appropriations of the First Assistant Postmaster General; employees of the Air Mail Service; Cost Ascertainment employees—until such time as they shall be transferred to the departmental roll; employees upon the field roll of the Division of Equipment and Supplies and all employees of the custodial service except charwomen and charmen and those working part time, to perform service on Saturday they shall be allowed compensatory time for such service on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday on which the excess service was performed."

That was the provision of the House bill. The Senate struck out first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, and struck out inspectors. That was the principal point of disagreement when the bill went to conference. Therefore the conferees agreed upon a compromise for those four classes, as follows:

Those whose salaries are over \$5,000 and not over \$7,999, 5 percent of their regular peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are over \$4,000 and not over \$5,000, 10 percent of their regular peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are over \$2,000 and not over \$4,000, 15 percent of their peacetime salaries; those whose salaries are \$2,000, or under, 20 percent of their peacetime salaries.

Mr. President, that represents a saving, compared with what the bill provided as it passed the House, of several million dollars, I am informed.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee—

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will wait a moment, I wish to say that this is a compromise agreed to by a majority of the Senate conferees and by every one of the House conferees, and is acceptable to the employees themselves, so far as I have been able to learn from their organizations, and elsewhere. It would result in saving an enormous amount of money to the Government. It does increase to a small extent some salaries. Those receiving over \$8,000 would not have any increase at all. That is the situation.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. If a Senator is opposed to giving overtime to employees, he should vote "nay." If he is in favor of putting the employees concerned on the same basis with other employees of the Government who are getting overtime pay during the war, he should vote "yea," and I hope the Senator from Vermont will vote in the affirmative.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. I thought the Senator from Vermont had the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee desires to be correct, but he has made two definitely incorrect statements.

Mr. McKELLAR. I made one incorrect statement, the one about fourth-class postmasters. Theirs was a different situation. Their compensation had been raised previously, so they are out of the picture, and their compensation was raised more than that of any of the other employees.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Tennessee knows better than that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know better than that. I know that is true. There is no use bandying words with the Senator.

Mr. REED. There was a bill before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads providing for a change in the basis of compensation from the commission basis to a definite salary basis. First, the committee turned that down. Largely because the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I insisted that the fourth-class postmasters should be put on a salary basis, about the same, as nearly as we could get it, as their former basis it was reconsidered and the change made. The main reason for the change was the request of the department for simplification in administration, which would be brought about. Fourth-class postmasters are not at all affected by this bill. Under a measure previously passed they have been given a 15-percent increase. Some of my colleagues have asked me concerning my attitude toward other employees than postmasters. I have labored under considerable difficulty. I have not been able to get the conferees even to read the minority views which affect only first-, second-, and third-class postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very sorry, but the Senator from Kansas wrote a report consisting of 40 pages,

more or less, as I remember. I will not be absolutely certain with respect to the number of pages, but the report is very long, and honestly I did not understand the Senator's report, just as I cannot understand the present attitude of the Senator, who was once a postal inspector. I cannot imagine why the Senator should have such a tremendous antipathy to the increase provided in the measure for post-office inspectors. The measure does not give post-office inspectors anything like the increase given them by the House.

We do not give them even half the increase the House gave them. I read the Senator's report and I tried to understand it, but did not. I am sure my failure to understand it is due to my lack of mentality, and not because there is anything the matter with the report. I do not understand the language of the minority report.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee does not undertake to say he read the report, because I am sure he never has. Permit me to quote one sentence from the minority report for the benefit of my colleagues:

I find no fault with this overtime provision except so far as the pay of postmasters is concerned.

I wish to correct the Senator from Tennessee in another respect. He stated that the so-called compromise adopted by the majority of the conferees was several million less than the original House provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have just been assured by Mr. Purdum, Second Assistant Postmaster General, over the telephone, in this respect. I called Mr. Purdum on the telephone a few minutes ago, at the request of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], because I did not have the figures. The figures were not given in the hearings. Mr. Purdum is fairly accurate, I take it. He thought the compromise figures were several million dollars less than the House provision. At any rate, he said they were very much less than the House provision.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my impression is that there were two so-called compromise provisions. The Senator from Tennessee will remember that the conferees discussed some other percentage than the one finally agreed upon. The one finally agreed upon exceeded the other proposed "compromise." I do not know that a statement of the exact amount of money under the House bill as it stood was ever given to the committee, but my impression is that if it had been given to the committee it would have been found to be less than the so-called compromise contained in the conference report.

Mr. President, I wish to leave this thought with the Senate: I am raising no question and the minority report raises no question except with respect to overtime or extra pay for postmasters. So far as all other classes of employees are concerned I approve the bill and the minority report approves the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Sena-

tor from Kansas yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee for further information. As I understand, Congress has previously passed legislation dealing with fourth-class postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I regret I said they were included in the present measure. They were provided for in a previous law.

Mr. AIKEN. That law did not include the other groups?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it did not include the other groups.

Mr. AIKEN. I see no reference in the pending measure to rural carriers. The bill covers city delivery carriers, but makes no mention of the rural carriers. Have the rural carriers been granted an increase by previous legislation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am very sorry I cannot tell the Senator from Vermont about that. My friend the Senator from Kansas knows the post-office situation, and I will ask him to answer the question.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that the rural carriers have a very serious problem in the matter of upkeep of equipment and other troubles that are incidental to the war, and that it would be rather unfair to exclude them from the benefits of any increase in salaries. Does the Senator from Kansas know about that matter?

Mr. REED. Under House bill 1366, if I remember the number of the bill correctly, adopted 1 year ago, the rural carriers, the city carriers, the post-office clerks, and the assistant postmasters were given overtime pay. Where they were paid on an hourly basis or a commission basis, we gave them 15 percent, which would apply to clerk hire in third-class post offices and to fourth-class postmasters. All classes of employees except those included in the present measure have already gotten 15 percent or more.

A year ago we voted a so-called bonus of \$300 to all classes of postal employees, including postmasters. Every postmaster received a \$300 increase last year. That was supposed to be the equivalent of the increase provided under the Little Steel formula. So every postmaster in the land, first, second, and third, has already received \$300 salary increase last year, which brings it up to the Little Steel formula standard of salary increases.

Fourth-class postmasters were changed from a commission basis to a money or salary basis, and they were given a 15-percent increase. So a great majority of postal employees have already received these benefits. The clerks, the rural carriers and city carriers, and assistant postmasters are receiving the \$300, plus overtime pay for actual time of work. No one raises any question about that. That is not involved in the consideration of the pending measure at all. The bill endeavors to give postmasters something which I do not think they are entitled to receive.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Kansas consider a specific example? Let us assume that a third-class postmaster

who had received a salary of \$2,000 a year or more ago was granted a \$300 increase; that would make his salary \$2,300.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the amendment which provides for a 20-percent increase mean that such an individual would receive 20 percent of \$2,000 in addition to the \$2,300 or in addition to the \$2,000?

Mr. REED. Yes; he would. The question of the Senator from Vermont is what happens in the case of a third-class postmaster whose salary was \$2,000. He received a \$300 increase last year, which makes a total of \$2,300. This bill would give him 20 percent, which is \$400 more, which makes a total of \$2,700, an increase of 45 percent, and if Fred Vinson does not advise the President to veto this measure he will be ruining his reputation for consistency in trying to hold the line. That is the situation. I think the proposal is unwise. It can be done if the Senate wants to do it, but I do not think we ought to do it. I think it is as outrageous a piece of legislation as has come to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Kansas has filed minority views, in which it was stated that there was no objection to the increase with respect to those affected by the bill other than postmasters. Is that correct?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. However, our situation now is that we are dealing with a conference report which we ourselves cannot amend.

Mr. REED. That is correct, but I may suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that we can reject the conference report, send it back to conference, and I assure the Senate that when it goes back to conference first- and second-class postmasters will be eliminated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If that would be so, I would vote to send it back to conference. But there are many of us who feel that, in keeping with the increases which have been granted to other Government employees, post-office employees, other than postmasters, perhaps, are entitled to some increase. I believe a statement to that effect was contained in the minority views filed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. I make no objection to that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But I understand that we are confronted with the situation of taking the conference report as it is or sending it back to conference. Am I correct about that?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if it is his understanding that the 20-percent increase is in addition to the \$300 which was granted a year ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

Mr. AIKEN. That would make, would it not, 45 percent in some cases?

Mr. McKELLAR. For every employee provided for in the bill salaries would be increased about 20 percent, except in the case of postmasters, some of whom

would have their salaries increased 5 percent, some 10 percent, and some 15 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. I think most of these employees are entitled to an increase because of wartime conditions.

Mr. McKELLAR. The majority of our committee thought so. So far as I recall, every member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, except the Senator from Kansas, thought that this compromise was an excellent one. I think I am correct in that statement. If I am mistaken, the Senator can correct me.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me it would be quite unfair for us to grant these increases, which in certain cases would amount to as much as 40 percent or more, and still hold the fourth-class postmasters to a 15-percent increase, and not do very much of anything about the salaries of rural mail carriers.

Mr. REED. The rural mail carriers and the others came before us and obtained their increases some time ago.

Mr. AIKEN. But those increases were not comparable to the increase which is proposed for the city mail carriers.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as the Senator may recall, Congress passed special legislation for the benefit of the rural mail carriers and granted them an increase. They are paid on a mileage basis. Their organizations appeared before the committee. What they requested has been allowed. So they have been cared for by the increased percentage which has been allowed them.

Mr. McKELLAR. And let me say that neither organization has made any complaint at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell me what the allowance was?

Mr. FERGUSON. One cent a mile.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; 1 cent a mile.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is approximately 20 percent; that is my impression.

Mr. AIKEN. Did they also receive an increase of 15 percent, or \$300, in salary?

Mr. McKELLAR. They also received that increase.

Our committee has tried its best to be fair and just. It was represented that those in the Post Office Department receiving the larger salaries should not have their salaries increased. The committee finally agreed, after days of argument, that those receiving over \$8,000 should not have their compensation increased at all, that those receiving between \$5,000 and \$8,000 should receive only a 5-percent increase, and that as the salaries become smaller the increase should become larger, until in the case of an employee receiving less than \$2,000 the increase would be 20 percent.

Mr. President, I simply cannot understand how a fairer adjustment of a very much discussed and carefully considered proposition could be made. I doubt if a fairer conclusion could have been reached. I believe it will meet with the approval of the postal employees and of everyone else.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I to understand that the fourth-class postmasters were to be on a straight-salary basis and were to receive an increase which would amount to approximately 15 percent?

Mr. McKELLAR. Fifteen percent or 20 percent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say it would be 15 percent, at a time when all post-office employees not on an annual basis, but on a commission basis, were given a 15-percent increase.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are not complaining, in any event.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The proposed increase, added to the increase granted a year ago, would break the Little Steel formula; would it not? Of course, I am not an advocate of the Little Steel formula; I want that clearly understood.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have heard of the Little Steel formula. But what it has to do with this matter is a question. Indirectly it has something to do with it. But I do not believe the Little Steel formula ever was intended to apply to an adjustment of salaries of postal employees. The Post Office Department pays its own way. The duties of every official and of every employee of the Post Office Department have been increased to a very great extent, as we all know. Their work and their duties have increased, naturally, during the war. Under those conditions it was thought that this adjustment was an exceedingly fair one. It has been agreed to, first, by the committees of both Houses, by both Houses themselves, and now by the conferees. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me correct the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from California, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I think there is one thing which might be said to clarify the answer to the question asked by the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. As I understand the matter, the 15-percent increase was given generally to effect the same result as that effected by the Little Steel formula. But at that time, as I recall, the employees of the Post Office Department were working perhaps 38, 40, 42 or 44 hours a week. Under the pending legislation, and prior to it, they have been working 48 hours a week. The pending legislation does not propose compensation under the Little Steel formula, but compensation merely for overtime work, just as a man working 40 hours a week in the steel industry would have been entitled to a 15-percent increase on the basis of the 40 hours a week, but that would not deny him additional compensation for overtime, if subsequently he was working 44 or 48 hours a week.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. I wish to correct the Senator from Tennessee again. I hesitate to correct him so often.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, Mr. President, that is all right. I do not think I ever have made a suggestion in my life which met with the approval of the Senator from Kansas. So I am delighted to have him correct me now or at any

future time or at any time he chooses to do so, because I have never been able to agree with the Senator about anything.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator does not want me to agree with him hereafter, that is his privilege. Certainly up to now I have been following him quite consistently.

The Senator said that both Houses had approved this provision. They never have done anything of the kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I did not say that. I said they have approved this bill. This bill has been approved by both Houses, and has gone to conference. With the exception of the Senator from Kansas, every member of the conference, comprising approximately seven or eight Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, has agreed to the conference report. The Senator from Kansas has taken what to my mind is the most unreasonable position in the world about a compromise. The Senator will remember that everyone of the conferees tried his best to shape the compromise in such a way that the Senator from Kansas would agree to it. But it made no difference what proposal was made; we never could suggest a proposal to which the Senator from Kansas would agree. I am very sorry to say that, but those are the facts. All the conferees, both the House conferees and the Senate conferees, will say that we tried our best to obtain an agreement which all of us could finally sign. If I remember correctly, I finally asked the Senator from Kansas if there was any arrangement to which he would agree. But I found there was none.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to correct the Senator from Tennessee for leaving the impression that the Senate passed this bill containing the provision relating to salaries of postmasters. It did nothing of the kind. When this bill passed the Senate, the provision with reference to salaries for first-, second-, and third-class postmasters was stricken out. I am sustaining now, and did so in the conference, the action taken by the Senate when it passed the bill. The Senator from Tennessee is the one who is receding from the Senate's position. I do not like to have the Senator from Tennessee leave impressions contrary to the exact facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator if it is not true that every member of the conference committee, with the exception of the Senator from Kansas, signed the conference report?

Mr. REED. What is the use of wasting time on a question such as that? The names of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the five House conferees are signed to the report. What is the use of wasting time on a thing which is obvious?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad it is obvious.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. There is one further matter which I should like to have cleared

up. On page 3 of the bill—I am not sure that I have before me the latest print of the bill—I find the following language:

In computing the overtime compensation the base pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one three-hundred-and-sixth of the respective per annum salaries and the base pay for 1 hour shall be considered to be one-eighth of the base pay so computed for 1 day.

I notice, in the case of postmasters, that that formula has been changed to a straight percentage; but if one three-hundred-and-sixth is to be taken as a formula in computing overtime pay for clerks in post offices, does not that establish a new formula for figuring overtime pay?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it does not establish a new formula. The Department established that formula, and we are trying to follow it to the best of our ability.

Mr. AIKEN. I was wondering how the formula of one three-hundred-and-sixth happened to be arrived at.

Mr. McKELLAR. I could not say. That is an administrative feature, with which I am not familiar. I was assured that that was the way to handle the matter equitably, and I took the statement of the Department with reference to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The postal employees affected submitted this language to the committee, and the committee referred it to the Department. The Department said, "That is exactly what we are doing." Therefore, I believe it would be better to crystallize into law the practice of the Department rather than to leave it to administrative discretion to change the formula at some future time.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason for my inquiry is that the Civil Service Committee has considered a great many bills, but I do not recall having seen the formula of one-three hundred and sixth provided in any of them. I was wondering how that figure was arrived at.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the formula established by the Department.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This is the problem which confronts me: I believe that the rank and file of postal employees are richly deserving of the consideration which this bill gives them, precisely as the Senator from Kansas has said.

Mr. REED. So do I.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I should vote to return the bill to conference, would it be a fair interpretation of my vote to say that it would be confined solely to a protest against the particular things which the Senator from Kansas has been discussing?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would mean that the whole bill would be returned to conference. When the bill would be taken up again, or when the conferees would agree, we do not know. The bill was in conference for a long time. Only after

a great number of meetings were the conferees able to agree. It is a mistake to say that returning the bill to conference would not affect the whole bill. I dislike to say that my friend is mistaken. He says that everything I say is a mistake. That is probably correct—

Mr. REED. I have never said anything of the kind.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will admit that I constantly make mistakes, as most of us do.

The question which the Senator from Michigan has just asked is very controversial. What would be the effect? The bill would go back to conference, and I have no doubt that it would be again reported by the conferees substantially as it is now, because compromises are necessary in order to have the bill passed. In the meantime we would be depriving the employees, to whom I have referred, of overtime pay, which practically all other Government employees are receiving. I do not think that would be fair to employees in the Postal Service.

I understand that the amount which would be saved by changing the rates with respect to first-, second-, and third-class postmasters and inspectors would be approximately \$600,000 a year. I was so informed over the telephone by Mr. Purdum. The question is, Are we going to deprive these employees, who, we are all agreed, should be paid as are other employees of the Government, of overtime pay because we think we are paying some of the first-, second-, and third-class postmasters too much?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I inquire who has the floor?

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. The question is, should we send the bill back to conference in view of the effect which such action would have? I hope the Senate will not do so.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. REED. I yielded to the Senator from Michigan and then permitted the Senator from Tennessee to answer a question. The Senator from Tennessee made a speech. I do not wish to yield further under those circumstances.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In view of what has been said by the able Senator from Tennessee, it seems that there is but one issue involved, and that is whether or not an increase is to be given to postmasters. The majority report and the minority views of the conferees both state that the other employees ought to receive increases. If the bill is to be sent back to conference, that will mean a definite instruction to the conferees from the Senate that they should eliminate the postmasters and return to the Senate the bill with the increase for postmasters deleted. So it seems to me—and I certainly would want my vote so understood—that in sending the bill back to conference we do so with instructions to

remove the objectionable part and bring the bill back here as it affects the other employees in the Postal Service.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. There is one other feature of the bill which it seems to me could stand correcting, and that is that the increase is proposed to be given to clerks in first- and second-class post offices only. Most of the third-class post offices have one clerk. Some of them have two clerks. I see no provision for giving an increase to clerks in third-class post offices.

Mr. REED. I should have been willing to compromise with the other conferees in allowing third-class postmasters a larger percentage of increase for clerk hire, but the other conferees did not wish to compromise on anything which would not grant an increase in salary for first- and second-class postmasters.

I should like to give a little further history of this proposal. When the bill came over from the House last year—I ask the attention of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], because he is a part of the play—it contained an increase for first-, second-, and third-class postmasters. I have no objection to helping third-class postmasters. Next to fourth-class postmasters, they are most deserving. The Senator from Arizona and myself talked about the proposed salary increase. It was discussed in the committee.

Two years ago the Postmaster General asked for a change in the law, with the definite and specific statement that there would be no increase in cost in connection with the administration of the overtime pay provision. The Senator from Arizona will remember that he and I were not quite satisfied with that statement. At least I was not, and he went along with me. We had investigations made by the Post Office Department itself, because there had been an increase of approximately \$60,000,000 in that item. I hold in my hand the returns to the Post Office Department, which have been sent to me for my information because they were requested in the name of the committee.

When we passed that bill we struck out first-, second-, and third-class postmasters. So far as first- and second-class postmasters are concerned, at least 75 percent of them have been inefficient, extravagant, and wasteful. They are now under criticism by the Department, and yet we are proposing to increase their pay as a reward for inefficiency and extravagance. That is the only issue involved. If the bill goes back to conference, and I am still a member of the conference committee, I shall be willing to grant some benefits to third-class postmasters. I am unwilling to raise the salaries of first- and second-class postmasters under these circumstances, and that is the only issue involved.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator has referred to my contact with the bill. I wish to make it perfectly clear that so far as the investigation which I conducted was concerned, the purpose

was to ascertain whether or not throughout the United States there were post offices in which clerks were receiving greater compensation than that received by postmasters. Such a check was made. It was found that in approximately one-fourth of the second-class post offices in the United States the compensation of postmasters was less than that received by the clerks. That was the investigation which I made. I do not know what investigation the Senator from Kansas made.

I should like to point out to the Senate that this bill passed the House on July 5, 1943. It came to the Senate and was referred to our committee. We investigated, checked, and double checked. The bill was finally reported to the Senate on March 29, 1944. The Senate did not pass it until about a month ago. The bill then went to conference.

We must agree that there are two equally coordinate branches of Congress. The Senate alone cannot legislate, any more than can the House. The House provided that all postmasters should be paid at a higher rate. The Senate, in order to reach a result struck it out. The bill went to conference. The conference committee arrived at a compromise between the views of the two Houses. There is no assurance in the world that if we send the bill back to conference the House will recede and take a different position than it took in the recent conference. I understand that the Senate conferees had great difficulty in finally coming to an agreement with the House conferees. So any Senator who believes that the Senate, if it rejects the conference report, will have its way, is mistaken. The result would probably be that legislation, which should have been enacted a year ago in order that justice be done to certain governmental employees, would be longer delayed. The responsibility for it will be on us when we vote on the conference report.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to the statement of the Senator. What he says is correct. I referred to the matter in the minority views. In some post offices an assistant postmaster or a clerk receives more salary than does the postmaster. The difference may be a few cents or a few dollars. The condition is brought about by the extravagance of the postmasters in their handling of overtime pay. The postmaster, by making a too-liberal allowance in overtime pay to others in his office, from the effects of his own act sets up a claim for an increase in his own compensation.

Mr. President, it has never been my policy to criticize my colleagues in conference. However, there was never a time in the conference on this bill when any conferee, other than myself, undertook to maintain the Senate's position on the salary question involved in this controversy. That is why we made no progress from the beginning. It was evident that I was the only conferee attempting to maintain the Senate's position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

Mr. McKELLAR. I first suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hatch	Reynolds
Bridges	Hayden	Robertson
Burton	Holman	Russell
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Capper	Kilgore	Stewart
Caraway	La Follette	Taft
Chandler	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Cordon	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	Wherry
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	Overton	Wilson
Gillette	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Were not the yeas and nays ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; they were not ordered; they were requested.

Mr. HATCH. I thought I heard the Chair distinctly announce there was a sufficient number to second the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now a sufficient number, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. If present he would vote "yea," and, if I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has been called away on official business. If he were present and permitted to vote he would vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am permitted to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHANDLER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent from the Sen-

ate because of illness. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "yea."

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business. I am advised that, if present and voting, they would vote "yea."

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. CLARK and Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, these Senators would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent. I am advised that, if present and voting, these Senators would also vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 12, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Gillette	Murray
Bankhead	Green	Nye
Bilbo	Guffey	Overton
Bridges	Hatch	Radcliffe
Caraway	Hayden	Reynolds
Chandler	Holman	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Connally	Kilgore	Stewart
Cordon	La Follette	Tydings
Danaher	McClellan	Wagner
Downey	McFarland	Wallgren
Eastland	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Ellender	Maybank	Wheeler
George	Millikin	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	

NAYS—12

Burton	Reed	Vandenberg
Butler	Revercomb	Wherry
Capper	Robertson	White
Moore	Taft	Wilson

NOT VOTING—40

Andrews	Barkley	*Buck
Austin	Bone	Bushfield
Ball	Brewster	Byrd
	Brooks	Clark, Idaho

Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Davis	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Maloney	Tobey
Glass	Mead	Truman
Gurney	O'Daniel	Tunnell
Hawkes	O'Mahoney	Walsh, Mass.
Hill	Pepper	Weeks
Jackson	Scrugham	Willis
Johnson, Calif.	Smith	
Langer	Thomas, Idaho	

So the report was agreed to.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted appropriating the sum of \$90,130.91 for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who have sustained losses by reason of war conditions which have been prevailing in all parts of the world during the past 5 years.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 29, 1944.

[Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State.]

TWENTY-SIXTH CONFERENCE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Twenty-sixth Conference of the International Labor Organization has just been held at Philadelphia. Representatives of the governments, employers and workers of 41 countries took part in its deliberations.

The conference, by a two-thirds majority, adopted recommendations on the following seven subjects:

1. Income security.
2. Social security for the armed forces.
3. Medical care.
4. Social policy in dependent territories.
5. Employment in the transition from war to peace.
6. The organization of employment services.
7. National planning of Public Works.

Under the constitution of the International Labor Organization, these recommendations are forwarded to the member governments for submission by them to their respective, competent national authorities. I shall accordingly submit them to the Congress in the regular way when certified copies are received.

The conference made other important decisions of which I think the Congress should be informed.

First, it adopted by unanimous vote a declaration of the aims and purposes of

the International Labor Organization, which has been referred to as the "Declaration of Philadelphia."

Secondly, it unanimously adopted resolutions concerning the social provisions of the peace settlement.

Thirdly, it unanimously adopted resolutions concerning the economic policies, international and national, required for the attainment of the social objectives of the United Nations.

Because of the interest and importance of these three documents, I am transmitting them herewith for the information of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 29, 1944.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT BILL DURING RECESS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate the Banking and Currency Committee may report Senate bill 1764 dealing with extension of the O. P. A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Robert L. Shivers, of Los Angeles, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district numbered 32, with headquarters at Honolulu, T. H., to fill an existing vacancy; and sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Corps, United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma;

Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the western district of Virginia; and

Julius J. Wichser, of Indiana, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Indiana.

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph F. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth H. McGill to be chief statistician in the Selective Service System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis A. Boening to be assistant State director of selective service for Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank D. Rash to be State director of selective service for Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the nomination of Mr. Rash be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Army from and including that of Brig. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell down to but not including First Lt. Milton Boyd Brandon, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask that all the Army nominations other than those which the Senator from Maine has asked be passed over, be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of their confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all Army nominations on the calendar except those passed over, will be confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

POSTMASTER AT WALNUT RIDGE, ARK.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of James J. Sharum, at Walnut Ridge, Ark., which has been reported today from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but which has not yet been placed on the calendar, be considered at this time, and that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations in the Selective Service System and the postmaster nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the Senator from Georgia in position to in-

dicate to the Senate what will be in order on Wednesday and Thursday?

Mr. GEORGE. On Wednesday it is proposed to take up for consideration the bill increasing the debt limitation.

Mr. WHITE. And that will be followed by the proposed legislation dealing with the O. P. A.?

Mr. GEORGE. The O. P. A. bill has not as yet been reported. I understand it is desired that it be taken up if it is reported by Wednesday.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator.

RECESS TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, May 31, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Richard F. Boyce, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

John J. Melly, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

James E. Henderson, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of The Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1944 (reappointments):

William W. Arnold, of Illinois.

Eugene Black, of Texas.

J. Edgar Murdock, of Pennsylvania.

Ernest H. Van Fossan, of Ohio.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

J. Francis Reilly, of Maryland, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the term of 3 years from July 1, 1944, vice Gregory Hankin.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Second Lt. Thomas Carlton Reddington, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 20, 1942.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Arthur Howland Baker, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1940.

Second Lt. Lawrence Augustus Adams, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Otto John Glasser, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 5, 1942.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Charles P. Cecil, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 4th day of February 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29 (legislative day of May 9), 1944:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Kenneth H. McGill to be chief statistician in the Selective Service System.

Louis A. Boening to be assistant State director of selective service for Illinois.

Frank D. Rash to be State director of selective service for Kentucky.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Milton Boyd Brandon
Stanleigh Erler
Charles Aloysius Furey, Jr.
Christian Gronbeck, Jr.
Charles John Hornisher
Harry Aloysius Horstman, Jr.
John McReynolds Jackson
Robert Samuel Jordan, Jr.
John Francis Pfeffer
Raoul Constantine Psaki, Jr.
Frank Bradway Rogers
Arthur Bernard Tarrow
Urban Linus Throm 2d
Philip Baker Watkins

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels with rank from April 1, 1944:

Alfred Schrieber Balsam, Quartermaster Corps (subject to examination required by law).

Howard Donnelly, Infantry.

John Nicholas Robinson, Infantry (subject to examination required by law).

Thomas James Hanley, Jr., Air Corps.

Jacob John Gerhardt, Infantry.

Leo Andrew Walton, Air Corps.

Ralph Pittman Cousins, Air Corps, to be a colonel, with rank from April 21, 1944.

To be colonels, with rank from May 1, 1944:

Charles Robert Finley, Coast Artillery Corps (subject to examination required by law).

Vernon Edwin Prichard, Field Artillery.

Adlai Howard Gilkeson, Infantry.

Richard Carlton Stickney, Infantry.

Hubert Reilly Harmon, Air Corps, to be a colonel, with rank from February 9, 1944.

To be colonels, with rank from March 1, 1944:

Benjamin Greeley Ferris, Infantry.

Charles Samuel Ritchel, Infantry.

Thomas Guerdon Hearn, Infantry.

Donald Henley, Infantry.

Joseph Daly Coughlan, Chemical Warfare Service.

Reese Maughan Howell, Field Artillery.

Henry Jervis Friese Miller, Air Corps (subject to examination required by law).

Medical Corps

To be colonels:

William Donaldson Fleming

Samuel Demetrius Avery

Francis Joseph Clune

George Edward Lindow

Jaime Julian Figueras

Dental Corps

William Elder Sankey, to be a colonel.

James Harvey Pence, to be a lieutenant colonel.

S. Kingdon Avery, to be a captain.

Veterinary Corps

Herbert Kelly Moore, to be a colonel.

Chaplains

Harry Dubois Southard, to be a colonel.

John Henry Hingson, to be a captain.

Medical Corps

To be captains:

Hugh Mullan

Joseph Davis Lea

Vince Moseley

William Richard Corcoran

Dental Corps

To be colonels:

Herman James Lambart

James Barrett Mockbee

Page Purnell Albert Chesser

H. Beecher Dierdorff, to be a major.

Pharmacy Corps

William Clarence Williams, to be a colonel.

Chaplains

To be captains:

Kenneth Malcolm Sowers

Walton Garrett Sugg, Jr.

John Michael Hughes

Verne Henry Warner

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Lt. Col. George Francis Wooley, Jr., to Signal Corps.

First Lt. Bidwell Moore, Infantry, to Field Artillery.

Second Lt. Thomas Wilson Sharkey, to Infantry.

Second Lt. John Metcalf Broderick, to Air Corps.

Second Lt. Lyle Marvin Lappin, to Air Corps.

Lt. Col. Richard Evans Glasson Ople, to Finance Department.

Second Lt. Frederick Charles Uhler, to Finance Department.

Lt. Col. Hobart Raymond Gay, to Cavalry.

Maj. Murray Bradshaw Crandall, to Infantry.

Second Lt. Bruce Wilds Postlethwaite Edgerton, to Air Corps.

Second Lt. Robert Edward Harrington, to Air Corps.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

James J. Sharum, Walnut Ridge.

COLORADO

Vida M. Roe, Avondale.

MISSOURI

Anna M. May, Jasper.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Charles Conrad LaLiberte, Claremont.

RHODE ISLAND

Bertha M. Brayton, Hope.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 29, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's unfailing friend, we approach Thy throne with gratitude and gladness for Thou hast placed at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

We pray that we may possess our blessings more worthily by seeking to be partners with all who are now safeguarding our noble heritage so courageously for their own and succeeding generations.

Bless our President, our Speaker, and these Thy servants whom Thou hast entrusted with positions of leadership in the life of our Republic, and may they be abundantly enriched with wisdom and strength as they strive to perform their duties with pure and steadfast devotion.

Grant that this Nation may be the honored instrument of God to bring in that blessed day when righteousness and peace shall flow everywhere as a mighty stream.

In Christ's name, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 26, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 23, 1944:

H. R. 3176. An act to regulate the furnishing of artificial limbs or other appliances to retired officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, and to certain civilian employees of the military and naval forces of the Regular Establishment.

On May 24, 1944:

H. R. 4519. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans.

On May 27, 1944:

H. R. 3356. An act to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War I and World War II and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children to include widows and children of World War II veterans for benefits under the latter act; and

H. R. 3377. An act to increase the rate of pension for World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, to \$60 per month in certain specified cases, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Shaner, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1173. An act to provide for staying judicial proceedings against the United States in time of war, on claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy, or for towage or salvage services to such vessels, when the Secretary of the Navy certifies that the prosecution of such proceedings would endanger the security of naval operations or interfere therewith, and to authorize the settlement and payment of such claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1834. An act to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled, "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment," approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314), with respect to the movement at Government expense, of dependents and household effects, of certain military personnel, and for other purposes; and

S. 1944. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind."

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. National Archives.
5. Department of War.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1758)

entitled "An act to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department and agency:

1. Department of War.
2. United States District Court for the District of Nebraska.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2928) entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes,' approved August 14, 1935, as amended."

HOOR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Thursday morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALLEY DWELLING ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1941) to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 (b) of the act known as the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, be amended to read as follows:

"(b) On and after July 1, 1945, it shall be unlawful to use or occupy any alley building or structure as a dwelling in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. That section 6 of such act be amended by striking "1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "1945."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 1525) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 87), authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof, in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before September 1, 1944.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding room at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at

Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives Establishment, Bureau of American Republics, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 10 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I recall, this is the regular resolution that has been introduced and passed by the Congress at intervals down through the years, the purpose of which is to clean up the folding room and rid it of worthless, uncalled for material.

Mr. JARMAN. That is true.

Mr. MICHENER. Every Member of the House will be given an opportunity to draw out such material to his credit as he desires before any final disposition is made?

Mr. JARMAN. He will be given until September 1 to do that. After September 1 a period of 30 days will be allowed for any other Member to withdraw material. If the gentleman, for instance, wants something that is to my credit there he can get it during that 30-day period. Then after that period a list will be submitted to the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution, and other agencies in the Capital, to permit them to use any document that they want. Whatever remains thereafter will be sold as paper by the Public Printer.

Mr. MICHENER. In short, every Member of Congress will be permitted to withdraw from the folding room before September 1, 1944, anything standing to his credit in the folding room. Every Member of Congress will be notified as to the documents belonging to Members which have not been withdrawn. Other Members will be given the privilege of withdrawing any material remaining. All material not desired by the Members will then be delivered to the Public Printer to be used in the best interest of the Government.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON THE C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 1527) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 88), authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (No. 1311) of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, dealing with the leadership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee; and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 50,000 additional copies of the report (No. 1311) of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, dealing with the leadership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee, of which 6,000 copies shall be for the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House, and 44,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address delivered by one of the distinguished Commissioners of the Maritime Commission, Hon. John M. Carmody, before the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce Maritime Day, May 22, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in regard to some activities in connection with Ducks Unlimited.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a radio address by our former colleague, Hon. Marvin Jones, entitled "A Timely Message in Regard to Food."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and some resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations, Inc. I am advised that if printed as one statement instead of two it will slightly exceed the two-page limit.

I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost \$121.33.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a wire and a letter with reference to the 30-percent cabaret tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and include in one an editorial and in the other a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and further to extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE EXPEDITING ACT

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3054) to amend the Expediting Act, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "sent" and insert "certified."

Page 2, line 5, after "brought", insert "which court shall thereupon have jurisdiction to hear and determine the appeal in such case."

Page 2, line 18, after "of", where it occurs the first time, insert "disqualification."

Page 3, strike out lines 5, 6, and 7 and insert:

"This act shall apply to every case pending before the Supreme Court of the United States on the date of its enactment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS] explain what the situation is?

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that was passed sometime ago by the House for the purpose of caring for the situation in the Supreme Court where it has been impossible to obtain a quorum for the disposition of one or two cases. It has already been passed by the House, and the Senate has made three or four minor amendments. For

instance, the House bill said that the record should be "sent" by the Supreme Court to the appropriate circuit court of appeals. The Senate provided it should be "certified," and provided that the court to which the case is certified shall then have jurisdiction to determine it. Another provision put in by the Senate deals with the disqualification of a member of the circuit court of appeals to which the case is certified. The last amendment merely limits the operation of the act to cases pending in the Supreme Court on the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on tomorrow for 20 minutes after the close of other business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 567, Rept. No. 1528) on the bill (H. R. 2241) to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the area embraced within and constituting said monument to its status as part of the Teton National Forest, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2241) to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the area embraced within and constituting said monument to its status as part of the Teton National Forest. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert with them a statement by O. S. Warden, president of the National Reclamation Association, which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and an editorial from the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 23, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include two items, one a speech by the commander of the American Legion in my State on I Am an American Day, and the other a letter from the Journeymen Barbers and Hairdressers of my State.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include an article entitled "India's Soft Spot."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from Fowler McCormick on the farm-implement situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State to the end that legislation may be enacted appropriating the sum of \$90,130.91 for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who have sustained losses by reason of war conditions which have been prevailing in all parts of the world during the past 5 years.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 29, 1944.

[Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State.]

CONFERENCE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The twenty-sixth conference of the International Labor Organization has just been held at Philadelphia. Representatives of the governments, employers, and workers of 41 countries took part in its deliberations.

The conference, by a two-thirds majority, adopted recommendations on the following seven subjects:

1. Income security.
2. Social security for the armed forces.
3. Medical care.
4. Social policy in dependent territories.
5. Employment in the transition from war to peace.
6. The organization of employment services.
7. National planning of public works.

Under the constitution of the International Labor Organization, these recommendations are forwarded to the member governments for submission by them to their respective competent national authorities. I shall accordingly submit them to the Congress in the regular way when certified copies are received.

The conference made other important decisions of which I think the Congress should be informed:

First, it adopted by unanimous vote a declaration of the aim and purposes of the International Labor Organization, which has been referred to as the Declaration of Philadelphia.

Secondly, it unanimously adopted resolutions concerning the social provisions of the peace settlement.

Thirdly, it unanimously adopted resolutions concerning the economic policies, international and national, required for the attainment of the social objectives of the United Nations.

Because of the interest and importance of these three documents, I am transmitting them herewith for the information of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 29, 1944.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a sermon by Rev. Arthur K. Wilson, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Piqua, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include a set of resolutions of the American Legion Post of Bloomfield, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate be continued through today and that half of the time be allotted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and the remaining one-half to myself.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from South Carolina mean that general debate shall be concluded today?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the Committee on Rules met this morning and has agreed to grant a rule waiving points of order in this bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. HARE. Yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. COX. It was the thought of the committee in reporting the resolution this morning waiving points of order, that the gentleman might, in view of that fact, be able to obtain unanimous consent to the waiver of points of order, which would expedite the final consideration of the bill. I wonder if you are prepared to make that request?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I make the further unanimous-consent request that all points of order be waived against items included in this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is recognized.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 28 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, your subcommittee charged with the responsibility to hear and determine the justifications for appropriations in the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, has discharged its responsibility and is now ready to submit its findings and conclusions to the House for further determination.

I am glad to report that the personnel of the committee is the same as those who reported a similar bill last year, namely, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from Minnesota [H. CARL ANDERSEN]. I am personally grateful to each and every member for the interest manifested and the cooperation demonstrated in our efforts to properly interpret and analyze the justifications submitted, and I want to emphasize how well they have demonstrated their individual responsibilities and relieved the chairman to a very large extent in an effort to ascertain the facts relative to each item, and it is a great pleasure to pay tribute to the manner and efficiency of their efforts to secure a proper solution of each problem. I desire to express not only my personal estimate, but the recognition of other members of the committee of the very capable and efficient services rendered by Mr. Robert E. Lambert, clerk of the committee. This is his first year to serve in this capacity, but I am sure every member of the committee will join me in paying tribute to his diligent, capable, and helpful assistance in analyzing the estimates submitted to the committee for consideration.

There are probably a number of items carried in this bill which do not have the full endorsement of each member, but I am glad to report that the facts submitted represent the cooperative and combined judgment of the entire membership of the committee.

I am convinced that if you will read the hearings, consisting of upward of 1,600 pages of printed matter, you will conclude that the committee has endeavored to obtain all the facts and exercise its best judgment in reaching a proper determination of all matters before it for consideration. Reductions in some of the items may seem rather drastic, and it may appear that further economies could have been effected by a reduction in other items, but the committee feels that no irreparable loss to the public will follow the reductions made and there will be little opportunity for waste or useless expenditure of funds by the failure of the committee to make further reductions. We may have made some mistakes in our conclusions and I shall not attempt to justify them further than to say that if there are any they can be attributed to the failure to secure

more thorough and complete information. Your committee has been fully conscious of the necessity in this emergency to reduce appropriations in non-defense activities as much as possible and it has not been unmindful of the many demands occasioned by the necessity of the defense program, but, regardless of what these latter demands may be, they do not relieve the committee of the necessity of making thorough inquiry into all justifications for appropriations for defense purposes, and we have, therefore, acted upon the theory that a dollar wasted or misspent in a defense activity is just as burdensome to the taxpayer as a dollar wasted or misspent for nondefense purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I shall first attempt to give an over-all picture of the contents of the bill and then present more detailed information relating to the various items if time permits. The total amount for the budget estimates submitted to the committee is \$1,174,437,200, as compared with appropriations for 1944 of \$1,166,845,610. The committee has approved \$1,104,972,514, a reduction of \$69,464,686 below the estimates and \$61,813,096 below the appropriations for 1944.

Many of the services supported by appropriations in this bill are normal operating agencies of the Government, but are, nevertheless, charged in many cases with heavy wartime burdens, and must, therefore, be implemented with sufficient funds to adequately discharge these responsibilities. Others have no additional duties imposed by the war but have found their normal operations enlarged to a more or less extent because of increased industrial and business activities.

A number of items carried in the bill are for the support of national-defense activities, a detailed statement of which will be found on page 24 of our report. The total carried for national-defense purposes, \$215,623,129, is \$58,699,871 less than the Budget estimates for 1945 and a decrease of \$88,908,221 under the appropriations for 1944.

Many of the items in the bill are for grants to States for cooperation in programs which have been established under law and for other purposes, costs of which are determined by operation of the various statutes involved and are, therefore, more or less mandatory. The committee has studied these items carefully and made reductions wherever possible. Severe cuts, however, cannot be made unless the Congress should determine to amend the basic statutes. The amount for such items carried in the bill, \$798,382,000, is a reduction of \$8,000,000 in the Budget estimate of \$806,382,000 for 1945, and an increase of \$33,689,000 over the appropriations, \$764,693,000 for 1944.

Eliminating the funds for national defense, \$215,623,129, and the funds for mandatory items, \$798,382,000, or a total of \$1,014,005,129, from the aggregate of the bill, \$1,104,972,514, leaves a net of \$90,967,385, which represents the funds appropriated for administrative expenses and for the cost of directing Federal activities which is subject to some control.

This represents a reduction of \$4,764,815 below the Budget estimate.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Department of Labor is a very important cog in the wheels of the Government and, therefore, has numerous wartime programs to administer. A year ago our Government and those charged with the prosecution of production in our defense program were much concerned over the question of absenteeism. Practically every agency coming before our committee expressed a vital interest in this problem, but although the problem has not been fully and completely solved, we are glad to report that much success has been made in eliminating what was considered an unnecessary high degree of absenteeism. The success can be attributed to the combined and cooperative efforts of many Government agencies with management and labor.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

It will be observed that the amount carried in this bill for the Secretary's office, \$454,500, is a reduction of \$27,900 under the Budget estimate for 1945. In fact, it is the same amount provided in the appropriation for 1944 plus the overtime pay as required by statute subsequent to the passage of the last appropriation bill. In view of reductions made in previous years we feel that while the amount provided for herein is not a great decrease under the Budget estimate, the amount carried will be sufficient and the reduction will not seriously interfere with the necessary work of this office.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses: The \$834,600 provided in the bill for the Solicitor's office is a reduction of \$65,400 from the Budget estimate. The sum of \$715,000 was provided for this service in the 1944 appropriation act and this amount plus \$119,600 overtime pay provided in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, accounts for the present amount. In some instances it would appear that the work load of the Solicitor's office has increased while in others it has decreased so that under proper administration the amount here provided should be sufficient to provide all necessary legal services for the various activities of the Department.

DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS

Salaries and expenses: The \$171,300 provided in the bill is a reduction of \$11,700 from the Budget estimate. One hundred and forty-six thousand dollars was provided for this item in the 1944 appropriation act, which amount plus \$25,300 overtime pay provided in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, accounts for the present amount.

In the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, there was provided an additional amount of \$200,000 for the same purposes as those stated in the above paragraph, plus an additional activity of "proper working conditions." To this amount was added \$15,000 as overtime pay in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944. The Budget estimate for the next fiscal year for this activity is \$551,000. It is pro-

posed in the present bill to eliminate this item in its entirety.

Subsequent to the declaration of war a national defense item under the same general provisions as those covered in the first paragraph above was set up and in the present bill there is provided \$169,200, which is a decrease of \$53,800 from the Budget estimate but an increase of the amount carried in the regular appropriation bill for 1944 in the amount of \$19,200 to cover overtime pay.

These three appropriation items are considered together in this report since the same activities, in general, are provided for therein. For some 10 years this division has been doing work in the field of health, safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry. The regular appropriation for safety and health has been augmented each year since the outbreak of the war by substantial national-defense amounts and it is proposed in this bill to continue an additional appropriation as a national-defense item as above stated in the amount of \$169,200.

Authority provided in the language of the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, as it is being administered appears to be a duplication of activities performed by other divisions of Government and there appears no justification for its continuation. A substantial number of positions have been filled in connection with this authorization and it was testified that one-half of the technical staff had come from some of the most important war industries and the remainder from agencies doing important war work. It is the opinion of the committee that all of these employees were rendering far more important service to the country in their former positions than can be rendered by them now in attempting to improve working conditions and handling labor relations. First, it is difficult to justify the "raiding" by the Government of industry to obtain employees, and second, it is difficult to justify the creation of a service that in large part, if not entirely, will duplicate work that has and will continue to be done by other agencies of the Government.

The committee has approved appropriations equal to the present fiscal year's amounts, plus overtime, for this division for its work in connection with improvement of health and safety of employees in industry, the work that it has been doing for some 10 years, and which, according to the testimony should be continued more aggressively than ever before for the reason that records on safety disclose that accident rates are increasing. The committee is not impressed with the attempted broadening of authority for this division and the duplication of work that inevitably occurs if the authority is given it to continue the "working conditions service" and the "handling of labor relations."

CONCILIATION SERVICE

The activities of the Conciliation Service have been greatly increased during the period of the emergency and appropriations have fully kept pace, the regu-

lar appropriation showing a substantial increase over the pre-war years and since 1942 has been supplemented by a national-defense item of substantial amounts, the present fiscal year having in this account the sum of \$1,670,300. The committee does not desire to cripple in any way the activities of this service but it is thought that for the fiscal year 1945 an amount of \$1,721,000, which is \$100,000 less than the Budget estimate should be sufficient to meet the needs of the Service.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: The \$1,212,300 proposed in the bill for the general item of "Salaries and expenses" is a reduction of \$100,000 from the Budget estimate and is made primarily for the reason that the services of this Bureau have not been utilized to the extent anticipated by certain agencies of the Government, especially by investigating committees of the Congress. It is the opinion of the committee that the Bureau stands ready to render a necessary and valuable service to different committees of the Congress and that its services properly utilized would save much time, effort, and expenses of such committees. The proposal to increase the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia from \$970,000 to \$1,160,000 is due to the payment of overtime. Since it is proposed to reduce the estimate by \$100,000 it follows that the limitation should be reduced by the amount of overtime that would be paid on the amount of the reduction or approximately 20 percent. Accordingly it is proposed that the amount which may be spent for the purpose mentioned should not exceed \$1,140,000.

The \$1,510,400 proposed in the bill for the national-defense item of "Salaries and expenses" is composed of an amount equal to the appropriations for the present fiscal year of \$1,365,400 plus an amount of \$145,000 approved by the committee to be used in making a more detailed study of the cost-of-living index by increasing the sampling for information to individual consumers. Experience gained during the past few years and a saving of time in covering again and again the same sources of information to keep such information current should permit the addition of some smaller towns and villages to the list of cities and larger communities now being covered in obtaining and correcting the information.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

The \$367,900 proposed in the bill for "Salaries and expenses" is a reduction from the Budget estimate of \$10,000. It is the opinion of the committee that from the experience gained during the past few years this amount may easily be absorbed.

Members of the committee have been impressed with the considerable amount of correspondence received in connection with the appropriation for this Bureau and the widespread interest in the demand that the appropriation be maintained at its present level, or increased. Such interest indicates that the public

generally will give wholehearted support to every effort of the Bureau to carry on its duties within the amount appropriated but Government employees who are beneficiaries of the appropriation concerned should not be used in having the Congress or members of the Committee on Appropriations circularized on behalf of such appropriation.

The proposed change in the amount that may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia from \$289,600 to \$328,000 is due in large part to overtime pay, and is a reduction in the limitation of \$2,000 from the amount proposed by the Budget, and is in keeping with the reduction in the total appropriation.

Salaries and expenses, Fair Labor Standards Act—the \$250,000 proposed in the bill for carrying out the duties imposed upon the Children's Bureau by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is a reduction of \$15,700 from the Budget estimate, and \$10,000 under the amounts appropriated for the present fiscal year. The committee is convinced that there is a considerable duplication in this service with the Wage and Hour Division and this fact is called to attention in the hope that during the coming fiscal year such duplication may be eliminated, and in the elimination a considerable saving should be made.

An increase of \$272,000 recommended by the Budget Bureau was shown to be largely for setting up a new division made up of child-labor consultants, assistant consultants, and the necessary clerical force.

The outstanding purpose of the new activity was to provide and submit advisory standards in industrial plants where children may be employed. However, more attention was given in the justifications to the necessity of additional help to aid the States in revising their forms, procedure, and instructions in connection with the issuance of certificates of age to persons for employment as provided for under the Fair Labor Standards Act. This proposal was to be a defense activity in its entirety, and we felt that under the justifications the high-type specialists called for would not be required in aiding the States in the issuance of certificates of employment, and we had the further thought that if the time of specialists requested should be given to submitting advisory standards for health and safety this would in large measure duplicate the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards, charged with the primary function of establishing standards for health and safety in all industrial plants. It would seem that such standards should take into consideration the health and safety of children as well as adults, and the proposed activity would in a large measure be a duplication of effort.

I am vitally interested in the work of the Children's Bureau, and I cannot speak too highly of a majority of its activities, but the necessity for this proposal did not impress the committee as being sufficiently essential to warrant approval of this item.

Grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care—national defense: The program to provide medical, nursing, and hospital maternity and infant care for wives and infants of enlisted men in the armed forces was inaugurated in March 1943, and since that time has grown by leaps and bounds. The initial appropriation to carry the program for approximately 3 months in fiscal year 1943 was \$1,200,000. Regular and deficiency appropriations for fiscal 1944 amount to \$29,700,000. It is difficult to estimate the needs for this program during the fiscal year 1945; but if present trends continue, the requested amount of \$42,800,000 will perhaps be insufficient.

The program is a cooperative one with the public health departments of the various States handling the actual administration of the program under plans approved by the Children's Bureau. Difficulties have been encountered, as may be expected in any new program, and the committee has endeavored to meet the more serious situations that have arisen through amendments. In the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, the program was confined to enlisted men in the four lower grades and that provision has been continued. The Bureau has requested and the Budget has approved language to permit a contribution of not to exceed 4 percent of the amount allotted to a State to be used for State administrative purposes. The committee has approved the language but has reduced the percentage to 2 percent. It is realized that the public health departments of the States have rendered a great service and in large part the success of the program has depended upon the efficiency of the States in administering this program. It has been shown that in instances the States have expended funds that otherwise could have been used in other health and child-welfare programs. But on the other hand the States have an interest in this program the same as the Nation and should expect to carry a part of the cost of administering it. Therefore a contribution of 2 percent of the amount allocated to a State for this program together with funds available in the State should be sufficient.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

The regular appropriation for this Bureau for salaries and expenses was \$160,000, with \$30,000 additional overtime as required by statute. The amount carried in this bill is \$189,600, which corresponds with the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, making a decrease of \$400 below the amount available for 1944.

In the Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944, the sum of \$50,000 was appropriated as a national-defense item to supplement the regular appropriation for salaries and expenses of this Bureau, the Budget estimate for the next fiscal year being \$200,000. It appears that the hours of work and wages for women are reasonably satisfactory and as there appears to be no discrimination against women in holding some of the better positions in industry for which the Bureau is entitled to much

credit it is the opinion of the committee that this item can be eliminated without interfering in any way with the work and functions of this Bureau.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Only few and slight changes are made in items providing for the normal activities of the Office of Education. An item of \$23,965 for library service is a reduction of \$35 compared with the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, no change being made for service to the blind. The amount for salaries is increased from \$333,450 for the present fiscal year to \$342,955 for 1945, a decrease of the Budget estimate of \$132,945. The increased estimate for salaries recommended by the Bureau of the Budget contemplated a large and rather ambitious program. A few years ago when we found a rather strained relationship existing between the United States and some of the Latin-American republics the State Department, with the hope of relieving the situation, inaugurated a cultural relationship program and, in the promotional work, some of the funds appropriated were transferred from the State Department to the Office of Education to be used in a cooperative way with the Latin-American countries, the program to be under the censorship of the State Department. In view of the reported successful efforts, the Office of Education now feels that the work should no longer be on a cooperative basis and confined to Latin-American countries, but the program should be an exclusive function of the Office of Education, and the work should be enlarged so as eventually to include work with all nations. We feel that the projected program is international and one that should be approached with the exercise of a great deal of diplomacy and, if it is to be greatly enlarged, the program should not only be at the suggestion of the State Department but should first be approved by that Department and legislative action taken by the Congress after presentation by the appropriate legislative committee. The committee, therefore, failed to approve the increased estimate for this purpose.

THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The bill provides for an appropriation of \$16,036,250 for general administration expenses, which represents an increase of \$1,587,250 over the appropriation for the present fiscal year and a decrease of \$1,645,750 under the Budget estimate. The Apprentice Training Service carries \$537,500, the same as that provided for the fiscal year 1944. The Apprentice Training Service for national defense carries an appropriation of \$400,000, or a decrease of \$237,700 below the Budget estimate. We cannot speak too highly of the Apprentice Training Service generally, but it appears from the estimates submitted by the Budget Bureau that the item for national defense should not be increased. The employment facilities and service carries an appropriation of \$57,968,079, or a decrease of \$664,921 under the appropriation for the fiscal year and a decrease of \$3,033,921 below the Budget estimate. We were impressed with the general efficiency of this work

but felt that with the experience of the past year in perfecting the organization throughout the country a slight decrease would not interfere with its efficiency for the next year.

The Training Within Industry Service for national defense carried an appropriation of \$2,207,500 for the past fiscal year. The Budget estimate was \$2,568,000. The amount carried in the bill for the next fiscal year is even \$2,000,000, or \$207,500 less than the appropriation for 1944 and a decrease of \$568,000 less than the Budget estimate. The hearings disclosed that this activity has contributed a most valuable service to our war production program by organizing the Training Within Industry Service in a large percentage of the war industry plants and it was indicated that probably the job may be completed by or possibly before the end of the next fiscal year and for this reason approximately 10 percent reductions have been recommended. The grand total for the War Manpower Commission is \$76,941,829, or a decrease of \$930,371 less than the amount carried for the fiscal year 1944 and approximately \$8,000,000 less than the Budget estimate.

In view of the heavy responsibilities and the enormous amount of work involved, it might appear that the committee made some rather drastic cuts in the appropriation. You will recall that this is a relatively new agency and the Congress was rather generous in its appropriation this past year, but those justifying the appropriation this year convinced the committee they have succeeded in organizing and streamlining the work to a point where they will be able to successfully carry out the program this next year with less money than was appropriated for the fiscal year 1944. I may be going a little out of the way to say so, but I am sure I express the feelings of the several members of the committee when I say we were all impressed with the successful manner in which this stupendous program has been executed by Mr. Appleby, in charge of the placement of available manpower throughout the country to meet the many strategic demands made in our war production program.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Grants to States for old-age assistance, aid for dependent children, and aid to the blind heretofore carried as three separate items have consolidated for convenience into one appropriation item. The change in no way will alter the functions of each unit but will eliminate the administrative necessity for transfer from one item to another. It is thought the consolidation will facilitate the work of the Board and the payments of grants. The amount carried for these items is \$403,600,000, the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau, but \$6,750,000 less than the amount provided for the fiscal year 1944. The amount carried for salaries in the Bureau of Public Assistance is \$950,000, an increase of \$7,000 over the appropriation for 1944, but \$34,000 less than the Budget estimate. The \$25,000,000 carried in the bill in the way of grants for States through the Unemploy-

ment Compensation Administration is \$6,000,000 below the Budget estimate and \$10,328,000 less than the appropriation for 1944. The committee felt that in view of the decrease in the number of persons drawing unemployment compensation would be projected into the next fiscal year and the amount appropriated would be sufficient to meet all requirements. The amount of \$3,400,000 carried for salaries for offices of the Board represents an increase of \$10,000 over the amount provided for 1944, but a decrease of \$143,000 below the Budget estimate.

The Social Security Board embodies five separate activities:

First. The maternity and child welfare program, administered by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

Second. The Public Health program, administered by the United States Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency.

Third. The other three, old-age and survivor's insurance, public assistance, and unemployment compensation are all administered by the Social Security Board of the Federal Security Agency.

The last three programs are administered by separate bureaus reporting to the Social Security Board. A study of the rather elaborate organizational structure would indicate that some simplification and streamlining of these activities would result in considerable savings in items for salaries and other administrative expenses. It would appear that the relationship between the programs of these three bureaus would not necessarily require them to remain in a separate operating organization under the Federal Security Agency and some thought has been given to the plan of reorganization which would establish each of these bureaus as a separate unit reporting directly to the Federal Security Administrator. Of course, such a realignment would require an amendment to the Social Security Act in order that the functions now vested in the Social Security Board might be transferred either to the Bureaus themselves or to the Federal Security Administrator. There has been some discussion of such an amendment and it is our thought that the organizational structure should be carefully examined with the view of providing the simplest machinery possible to administer these separate programs.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The amount of \$1,350,000 for Community War Services shows a decrease of \$400,000 below the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year. It will be recalled that this appropriation provides for four wartime activities:

First. The control of venereal diseases through suppression of prostitution.

Second. Assistance to communities in handling increased population by reason of war industries or military concentration.

Third. A Nation-wide promotional program to develop interest in physical culture for the purpose of maintaining a physically fit population.

The Social Protection Division in charge of the venereal-control program is rendering exceptional service to the Nation in eliminating the source of venereal disease. The Division will undoubtedly have a job to do so long as the war continues and the amount recommended by the committee is intended to provide the full amount included in the Budget for this work.

The Recreational Division, charged with the duty of giving assistance to communities in handling increased population by reason of war industries or military concentration, has been of commendable assistance to many communities in handling this problem. However, the population shift incident to war production and military concentration appears to have passed the peak. It may be that the problems incident to these population readjustments may not have been fully solved, but many of the communities have learned how to meet them and we feel that the end of the job of the Recreational Division may be in sight and the committee feels that the Administrator will find it possible to complete existing projects probably by the 1st of January 1945.

The Coordination of Welfare Functions for wartime needs is a necessity and continuing function and the amount recommended by the committee includes provisions for this service on the basis contemplated by the Budget estimate.

The Committee on Physical Fitness deserves a note of commendation for the interest it has created in the development of physical education programs among adults and school-age persons. Its contribution to the health of the Nation is not measurable but the committee feels that it is well worth the relatively small amount expended by the Government for this purpose.

Only slight changes are made in other items under this heading as compared with the appropriations for 1944 and the Budget estimates, the grand total for the Federal Security Agency being \$629,224,185, or a reduction of \$123,876,875 as compared with the appropriations for 1944 and a decrease of \$53,621,115 below the Budget estimate.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The items for salaries, miscellaneous expenses, printing and binding for the regular work of the National Labor Relations Board are the same as for the fiscal year 1944, but the salaries and expenses for national-defense activities are reduced from \$681,550 to even \$600,000, the amount carried in the Appropriation bill for 1944, less the overtime. The item for salaries and expenses in an enforcement of War Labor Disputes Act, Public Law 89, Seventy-eighth Congress, is \$112,500, a similar amount having been provided in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act for 1944. The grand total for the National Labor Relations Board is \$3,523,450, or an increase of \$30,950 over the amount carried in the bill for 1944, but \$625,550 less than the Budget estimate.

It will be recalled that with the hope of facilitating the work of this Board, curtailing the practice of raiding, obviat-

ing unnecessary friction in war production plants, and thereby promoting maximum production a provision was placed in the appropriation bill last year that where an agreement entered into between management and labor and no dissatisfaction had been or should be expressed within 3 months following the execution of the agreement, a limitation was placed on the appropriation for use by the Board to consider a complaint filed after the expiration of the 3 months and during the life of the appropriation. However, in view of a ruling by the Comptroller General and the Board's interpretation of the intention of the Congress some criticism of the provision arose. The committee, therefore, in its recent hearings afforded all interested parties an opportunity to appear with the idea that with additional information the provision may be amended so as to meet the objectives and remove any doubt as to the intentions of the Congress. All parties conceded that the provision had, in a measure, accomplished its objectives, and we now feel that the revised provision should accomplish the original purposes and meet with little or no criticism.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, for reasons beyond my control I have not inflicted myself on the House for the last few weeks. I might feel refreshed if I could divest myself of some of the opinions I have. I realize fully that I am surrounded by wiser men than I and should try to conform to their views. But somehow the wiser men do not seem to prevail in their views. I thought I might comment briefly on official lawlessness, official usurpation, and official excesses in demands on the people by their own Government. I desire to ask a few questions or make a few suggestions that would be provocative enough to bring forth responses which would be helpful, and reassure me that some of my fears are groundless.

Whither are we traveling? That is much on my mind, even as D-day approaches—a day which has an oppressive effect upon everybody so that we hardly dare complain of domestic problems. Warning signals, however, must not longer be postponed. It is a dreadful hour. But there is a great decision approaching in November. It is then that Representatives will hear the voice and verdict of the people. Will the people have been deluged with such a flood of propaganda that they will be in a frame of mind to give matters of government proper weight and attention? If I could make a few provocative suggestions to our people, to awaken them, I would feel that I had been helpful.

Republicans have as much patriotism in their hearts as Democrats. There is no party line. Few can be accused of lack of patriotism. There are just as many Republican sons over there as there are Democratic sons, and members of either party should not, and cannot, claim more patriotic impulses or greater desire to win the war. I am not criticizing the war effort. I know little about

it. I have full confidence in our military leaders.

How happy I am to learn that the health of our President is better. I wish him well. But it is a great relief to me to learn that he could depart from Washington for a month or more and the war still go on. Perhaps he could depart for a longer time and the war would still go on. It is reassuring to me that the military may still actually carry on the war, and that after all there is no indispensable man. The indispensable man is an illusion and a delusion. I hope our President himself does not have that delusion. I see a great danger ahead in the continuance of one man in the high office of President for too long a period. I shall say to my people, "If a fourth term happens, bid good-bye to your form of government." I shall not argue with them. I shall tell them. It does not admit of much real argument. It is only the argument of expediency that may be presented. The great Democratic leaders of the past have warned us, as well as the Republican leaders. This great danger has been of universal understanding and should be brought forcibly to the attention of our people. When one man will have appointed all the judiciary, filled all important offices with such selections as have only his own approval, he will then have such an enormous power that liberty and justice will be alienated from the people. This, to me, is extremely worrisome, and I shall talk plainly about it.

The most immediate problem is, of course, how to win the war. I am not suggesting that the military do not know how to conduct our military operations. As the representatives of the people, we will vote the money. Beyond that we can do little and can hardly allow any criticism. "How to write the peace." We may talk about that, but how guardedly those in power are now speaking on that question. Can we win the peace? I can foresee that the so-called imperialism of Great Britain is not to be interfered with. I can see Russia, "the colossus of Europe." We cannot hinder that apparently. We may well feel certain that after this war is over, there can only be an armed peace, secured by agreement of two or three nations, although hoping for a fourth.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman knows, of course, that spokesmen of both Great Britain and Russia have said, and every thinking person in this or any other country knows, that they are pursuing their own way; that they will have no part of the Atlantic Charter and that we, when this war is over, may expect the worst.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was coming to that. The Atlantic Charter was a pious expression. It was a beautiful ideal. When the colossus of Europe demands, as he unquestionably will, a large sphere of influence in those smaller countries, what chance will those little countries have in determining their own futures as promised in that Charter?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, has not the spokesman for the colossus of Europe already announced to the world that he proposes to take over certain of those little countries and parts of other little countries? He asked permission of no one. He announced his program. It seems to me that the people of this country should see that and see it clearly.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am sorry to say that there certainly can be no other interpretation of it. I am not criticizing Russia for the moment. We wanted her to win the war. How highly we were praising her in her endeavors to win the war and the sacrifices that she has made. The type of government they have in Russia we want none of. Liberty does not exist in Russia. Some have tried to tell us that she is turning toward the capitalistic system. Not at all. Of course, the workers are now paid more according to their ability and not according to their need, as was the old doctrine. Everybody and everything that is owned is subject to the will of the state. Strikes in Russia: We are told that a striker's reward is only to be shot.

We cannot agree to her ideology. When we come to frame a peace and arrange trade between the countries, exchange good will and friendship, will we dare demand freedom for those small nations, to determine for themselves their form of government and to decide their own problems?

Let us face the facts. Russia has spoken. She has fought the fight. She feels that she should have her part in dictating the future. But as to spheres of influence, what will we say to those little countries we have tried so hard to assist? What can we do except indulge in pious talk, and suggest agreements that are immediately torpedoed?

No. Our great friends, the British people—and they are our friends—are beginning now to read carefully the statements of our leaders. They wonder just what agreements Britain and this country can make regarding trade and monetary relations. Does she trust us when we advocate a free exchange of goods?

When there is talk about a free exchange of goods or of free trade, and at the moment there is a great and growing demand, I can hark back to the first weeks I was in the Congress, when the farmers were demanding a tariff to protect themselves from little Denmark's butter. When I see that high wages must prevail after the war—it is so declared—how can these things be arranged so that our workers can meet competition, unless high wages prevail in other nations?

We have our own immediate domestic problems. We ought to face them. We have various and sundry persons proclaiming new doctrines which attract much attention. Stuart Chase, a great writer, tells us, in effect, that if we can borrow \$250,000,000,000 or \$300,000,000,-

000 to fight a war, certainly we can borrow to keep things going in the peace. What care such writers whether they wreck the Treasury or not? No; they are trying to teach our people that we should have all these social gains from the cradle to the grave; that everybody should be looked out for. They are practically telling those people who receive, or would receive, largesses from the Government that they would not be the ones whom they intend to tax. Many classes of people in this country think they can have all these things for the asking, that someone else will pay for them. It may be that is somewhat true if we intend to continue tax methods now and recently followed.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. We learn to our sorrow that no one yet has devised a system of government superior to simple arithmetic, and no one yet has devised a substitute for work.

Mr. GIFFORD. No. But the gentleman will recall the statement made by one of the social planners high in the New Deal, who said, "We will tax ourselves and pay ourselves a pension. We should pay all sorts of subsidies, then tax ourselves to pay the subsidies," but with the thought held out that the tax would not apply to the ones who get the subsidy.

Shall we be able to collaborate, shall we be able to cooperate, and not amalgamate with other nations when the war is over? I do not want to get too far away from that question. I want to collaborate, I want to cooperate, but I do not want to amalgamate.

Mr. DONDERO. Along that line, may I suggest that there seems to be a feeling on the part of some people in this country that through some mysterious process money can be collected from them and brought here to Washington, administrative expenses deducted, and then more money and benefits sent back to them.

Mr. GIFFORD. Can we teach our people the fallacy of such an opinion?

I have felt a frustration in my endeavors of late to help my people, because of Government exactions, bureaucratic exactions, if you want to call them that, from the agencies that we ourselves set up. Do we lack the courage to tell those agencies how to operate or the policies they should follow? We are frustrated because under the supposed war powers the executive agencies may get directives from the President, even though they be exactly contrary to our own intentions in enacting the law.

There must be a halt to this sort of thing. Are we to wait until after November, until we have heard the voice of the people? I think there should be a real campaign on domestic issues. The people should be informed and warned that their form of government is in real jeopardy. I, for one, shall not hesitate to speak my mind about it.

I have been here a long time. I have seen representative government at work. I know full well that the great majority

of our people still think that we are really their representatives, and that they should appeal to us for relief from exactions in Washington. They still have that idea. But now, because of bureaucratic control, when a complaint comes to you, you have to appeal to a bureaucrat.

It is said that bureaucrats are usually selected because of their education. But an educated man should be surrounded by others who are much wiser than he in the practical conditions to be met in any proposal.

I have pleaded with the O. P. A. for my fisheries; I have pleaded with them for my dairymen; I have pleaded with them for my fresh fruits. I am constantly pleading for relief. How far do I get? I get answers to my letters, after telephone arguments, and then I send copies of those letters to my newspapers so they may notify the people at large. Have I succeeded in bringing relief? Well, if relief is the knowledge that you cannot get anything, we get relief, and that perhaps is really some relief. But I want my people to awaken to the fact that their Representative in Congress, supposed to make the laws of the land, cannot be effective under a bureaucratic form of government.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Speaking of relief, I think the gentleman will agree that sometimes after worrying about a proposition for week after week it is a relief to know the worst.

Mr. GIFFORD. A relief to know the worst. That is putting in another way the thought I was vainly trying to express.

This administration has attempted, at the expense of the Treasury, to bring relief, even boondoggling relief. Millions of jobs have been provided in Government services. I think I may say that the people have been well lathered, and I remember the old expression that he who is well lathered is half shaved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have many matters for discussion here. So many things to worry about. I wonder if I could refer back to Thomas Jefferson? Would it be of any good to do that these days? I think it ought. I love my Democratic friends. I really do. My friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], the other day did not like something that the New Deal has done. He fought brilliantly on the floor. I voted with him. There is a large segment of the Democratic Party which views with alarm many New Deal doctrines, and if they could be released from the party condition that exists they would be happy to join us in checking the excesses of the so-called New Deal.

I have a great worry about the public debt. I have made many speeches here about it. Stuart Chase seems to have

no worry about it. Many others whom I might mention seem to have no worry. I do not suppose young Michael Streit, who gave that dinner to 100 new dealers where he said, "The New Deal is more revolutionary than fascism"—it is revolutionary—has any such worries. Such leaders have a definite goal about which many of you Democrats are fearful. They intend to take possession of your party. The Communists have disbanded, but only in name. They are perfectly content to back the New Deal because it is bringing about a condition in this country such as they desire for their own aims later on. No wonder one of your great Democratic United States Senators said recently, "If they have come into the party it would now seem necessary that I go out." Oh, strange bedfellows are they who are agitating for the fourth term. I am not an isolationist. I want independence, but isolationism is too high a price to pay for that sort of independence. I want to collaborate and hope I am fully understood in that statement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman has referred to collaboration. There is a lot of literature coming to my desk which deals with that question. It is coming from two groups and I somewhat hesitate to make this comparison, but the literature speaks for itself, the C. I. O. and from church leaders, and it is growing in volume in personal letters, periodicals, published statements, news comments over their signatures, and I wish to submit this question to the gentleman. So long as world power politics are to be the program, does the Congress of the United States dare surrender its power to determine these questions which deal with how far we shall go in international relationships? I say, does the Congress dare surrender its power to make a determination and thus amalgamate, or must we retain our power to collaborate so that the forces of the United States will remain in the hands of Congress?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I hope we will be courageous enough to retain the power in the hands of the Congress itself. To amalgamate is far different than to cooperate, or to collaborate. So I ask you, as my purpose in rising today, if you can allay my fears and give me a word of advice or encouragement, so that I may feel when I do come back, and I expect to come back, that I shall be able to represent my people without too much hindrance in this bureaucratic government. I thank the gentleman in charge of the time for the time allowed me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] 15 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my very deep appreciation of the exceedingly capable service which has been rendered to the Congress and to the country by the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], in the preparation and presentation of this bill. He

has, of course, had able and faithful assistance from my colleagues, both on the Democratic and on the Republican side. But as we all know, the greatest portion of the burden in the preparation of a bill of this type, in the examination of its multitude of details, rests upon the chairman of the subcommittee and I happen to know that the gentleman from South Carolina has spent not only weeks in conducting the hearings which were had on the bill, but many, many hours in the evenings and at other times when the House was not in session in the study of the various estimates which form the basis of the bill.

I know that he is largely responsible for the tremendous savings below Budget estimates which are represented by the bill as presented to the House. His services in connection with this bill alone have been the cause of savings amounting to many millions of dollars to the Treasury of the United States. I am not in accord with all of the provisions contained in the bill. I am not in accord with all of the reductions which have been made in the bill. Our subcommittee has lacked unanimity with regard to a number of these reductions. It is not my purpose today to undertake to discuss these matters in detail, first because there are very few Members on the floor, and second because I apprehend that these matters will come up for discussion when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule on Thursday of this week.

However, I do desire to have in the Record for the information of the members of the Committee of the Whole, some observations with reference to a provision which was contained in the bill, as reported from the subcommittee, relating to the appropriation for grants to States for emergency maternity and infant care. I want those observations in the Record in order that the attention of the Members of Congress may be directed thereto, and in order that they may give some study to the problem which is involved, prior to the reading of the bill for amendment on Thursday, at which time, depending on what sentiment may be developed in the House with reference to the subject matter, I may or may not offer an amendment which I shall now discuss.

In the bill as reported from the subcommittee to the Full Committee on Appropriations there was contained the following proviso with reference to the E. M. I. C. program, which proviso was stricken from the bill by the full committee:

Provided further, That this appropriation and appropriations heretofore made for the same purpose, may be used for payment of benefits in cases of wives of such servicemen who fail to submit a notice and application prior to confinement, in all cases in which it shall be made satisfactorily to appear that such wives were unaware of their entitlement to such benefits prior to confinement, or were prevented by unavoidable causes from submitting such notice and application prior to confinement.

This program, as the Members know, is that which has been provided by Congress for taking care of the medical expenses and hospital expenses of the wives

of servicemen in the four lowest grades, in connection with their confinement. The appropriation carried in the bill for the next fiscal year for this purpose is \$42,800,000.

I hope the Members will find it convenient to examine the hearings with reference to this particular subject matter. If they do, they will find that, according to the testimony of Miss Lenroot, head of the Children's Bureau, and of Dr. Eliot, an official of the Children's Bureau, there were during the last 6 months of the calendar year 1943, 285,000 cases in which such benefits might have been granted under the provisions of the program as authorized by the Congress; but benefits were paid only in 145,000 of those 285,000 cases. The testimony of Miss Lenroot and of Dr. Eliot indicates their belief that the failure of 140,000 wives who were confined during the last half of the calendar year 1943, to apply for these benefits was occasioned by their not having been aware of the existence of the program and of their right to receive such benefits upon proper application.

The evidence also justifies the conclusion that in many thousands of these cases bills for medical expenses and hospital care hang over the wives of these servicemen who did not file application within the time provided by the regulations, and over their husbands who are in the service, until this good day, and that aid to them from the appropriations which have been made by the Congress has been denied for one reason only. That is because prior to their confinement they did not file notice and application with the proper State health authorities, and except for this difference their rights are the same as those of wives whose claims have been paid.

You will observe from the evidence that this rule with reference to the filing of notice and application has been construed to apply to cases in which wives were prematurely confined. In one case it developed that a wife had been confined after a period of 6 months' pregnancy, yet the benefits in that case were denied because that wife, who, of course, had no reason to apprehend her premature confinement, had not filed notice and application for the benefits under this program, prior to the time when she was confined.

It is my viewpoint that these 140,000 women, if they are in need of assistance which is granted by the Government under this program, are entitled to the same consideration which has been had by 145,000 women who did file applications during the last 6 months of 1943 and who knew about the existence of the program and who took all of the steps necessary under the regulations to see to it that they received those benefits. At the present time participation in the benefits of the program is approaching 100 percent, since knowledge of its existence has become general.

The language of the proviso which I read to you in the outset of my remarks, however, does not make it mandatory upon those officials who are in charge of the administration of the program, to pay benefits in all the cases where they have not been paid. It simply places in

their discretion the payment of such benefits when, in accordance with the regulations prepared by them, it shall be made satisfactorily to appear that the failure of the wife to file notice, to make application prior to her confinement, was occasioned by her being unaware of her entitlement to benefits under the program, or was caused by unavoidable circumstances, the authorities in charge of the program, of course, having the power and duty to determine what circumstances would be properly considered unavoidable.

It may be true, perhaps, that the language of the proviso, as it was originally written in the bill by the subcommittee, is broad in its terms. However, I do not think that language is too broad. I do not believe that the wives of these servicemen who did not know of the existence of the program ought to be required to pay, or their husbands pay their own bills, their medical bills and hospital care bills incurred since this program began in confinement cases, merely because of their lack of knowledge of their entitlement to benefits, when other wives who did know about the program, who perhaps were not in some cases as much in need as those who had no knowledge of it, have received these benefits in full.

It has been stated in committee that the placing of this proviso in the bill would occasion a tremendous amount of additional expense. I do not believe it is possible that the additional expense incurred would be out of proportion to the just benefits awarded, but whatever the expense might be, there is absolutely no justification, in my judgment, for the Government saying to a woman who has been well informed as to the development of this program that, "because you knew about it, because you took action and made application, gave notice prior to the time of your confinement, you can have your doctor bill paid and you can have your hospital bill paid"; but to the woman who may live away back in the hills, or who perhaps is not very well educated, who perhaps does not receive a daily paper or any other sort of paper, who knew nothing about the program being in existence, that she must be barred, because, forsooth, the State health authority had adopted regulations approved by the Children's Bureau, in which she was required to give notice and make application prior to confinement. I want to say again that that debarment exists notwithstanding she may have been prematurely confined. It is an absolutely senseless thing to require the making of an application prior to confinement in the case of a woman who did not know she would be confined in 3, 4, or 5 or 6 months and who was prematurely confined.

It is my purpose after further conference with other members of the committee—I think it is possible they may give their approval to it—to submit a modified form of this proviso which would take care of cases where need is shown and cases particularly of the type to which I have last referred where notice and application were not submitted prior to confinement on account of unavoidable circumstances.

You will hear it said by those who have opposed this proviso that these regulations are made by State health authorities and that the purpose of the Congress was to leave the matter entirely within the jurisdiction of State health authorities. There is not anything in the law which requires this regulation as to the giving of notice and the filing of application prior to confinement. That is a regulation, but when they say that it is a regulation of the State health authorities they do not mention the fact that the Children's Bureau, as will appear from our hearings, in their bulletin No. 1 to State health authorities, for 21 pages outline the type of regulations that the State health authorities must adopt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. They specify the type of regulations down to the dotting of an "i" and the crossing of a "t" that the State health authorities must adopt in order for those regulations to receive the approval of the Children's Bureau; so, of course, the State health authorities, in order to have their regulations approved, have simply followed in detail the requirements laid down for them by the Children's Bureau and have adopted the regulations which they were directed to adopt by the Children's Bureau. You will hear them say also as they said in the full Committee on Appropriations that exceptions are authorized to the rules made by these State regulations; that Miss Lenroot, the head of the Children's Bureau, has written State health authorities that they are justified in making exceptions in cases of the kind to which I referred a while ago where women were confined after 6 months' pregnancy. That does not alter the situation, because the fact remains that the State health authorities in cases coming under my observation have not made the exceptions.

Whether they were authorized to do it or not they have not in fact done it and they have not in one particular case which came under my observation in my own district made any payment of benefits in that particular type of case. You will hear opponents of this proviso say also that the proviso would require a great deal of administrative work, it would be administratively unworkable. That is answered by the suggestion to which I referred a moment ago; that is, the claim that the Children's Bureau will permit them now to make exceptions, and if that is true, then the Children's Bureau has now authorized the State health authorities to consider these individual cases and to approve exceptions when in their judgment it ought to be done; and the proviso in the bill would require nothing more than that except that it would indicate the purpose of Congress that in cases where it is satisfactorily shown that lack of knowledge of the program existed on the part of the wife of a serviceman or that she was prevented by unavoidable circumstances from submitting a notice and application

payment of benefits provided by the program should be made.

I have submitted these views in order that you might be thinking about the matter and that other Members of the House who are not here today might have an opportunity to read what I have said concerning this problem in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the hope that by the time we reach this section of the bill for reading under the 5-minute rule on Thursday the House may have reached the conclusion that some sort of proviso in this appropriation language should be adopted which would prevent the continuance of injustices of the type I have described.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not at this time desire to attempt to answer the argument just concluded by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. It is enough to say as one who originally sponsored this program in the House, that I am interested in its continuation and not its destruction. Because of that fact I very vigorously opposed the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia in the subcommittee and in the full committee; and if it is sought to include this amendment when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule I believe the House will then be advised of the facts which prompted the full Appropriations Committee by an overwhelming vote to strike such an amendment out of the bill.

I do not want the RECORD to disclose that the gentleman's argument was made without any statement to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, tomorrow on Memorial Day while strewing pretty bouquets upon the graves of soldiers of former wars, why not cast a thought toward saving the lives of some of the young soldiers imperiled in this one?

Today I shall insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Constantine Brown on the pending invasion. Mr. Brown is an informed and reliable writer—if any writer is reliable nowadays when newspapers are cowed into suppressing unpleasant facts and conclusions. Not mentioned in this article is the fact that the Luftwaffe should be destroyed before we invade, and that the Luftwaffe has not yet been destroyed. The invasion, if it occurs as scheduled, is premature.

Regardless of how many Germans will be killed in this invasion, the operation will have maimed or destroyed hordes of innocent American youths.

Why not think about that now, while the President can still postpone the invasion if he chooses, instead of waiting until after these young soldiers are too

dead to hear the praises and see the posies appropriated to their memory?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to relate for the benefit of the House a short outline of a story with a United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration background which, as I believe all of you will agree, shows the most shameful disregard for human safety at sea, for economy and for a particular private industry on the part of responsible procurement officials in those agencies. It is a story in which our own Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House has already evinced interest and in which each of you here will, I believe, be amazed.

This matter relates vitally to the safety of the men of the merchant marine and the Navy, whose heroism and tenacity of purpose have kept the life lines to a dozen distant battle fronts open; but its background lies in my home city of Kokomo, Ind., a spot about as far from salt water as you can find on our map.

Back in the summer of 1941, when our defense program was just getting up steam, the Globe American Corporation of Kokomo abandoned its 50-year-old peacetime business of stove manufacture to take up the production of lifeboats. By any standard, this was a smaller industry, even though sound and far-sighted management had built and developed it upon a strong foundation. Its normal peacetime pay roll averaged perhaps 350 people. Starting cold in the new field of lifeboat building, the company quickly proved its right to the Maritime Commission M award, which in that field is the equivalent of the more commonly known Army-Navy E award. In short, Globe did an outstanding production job that has been a very real and important contribution in our war effort.

Then, just a little over a year ago, Globe added to its war work an entirely new and greatly improved type of life raft. To describe it as briefly as possible, this new raft is all-steel construction throughout, and represents such vast advantages from the standpoint of safety and comfort that it has been hailed by the United States Coast Guard, the agency charged with maintaining maritime safety standards, and by an overwhelming majority of shipbuilders and American seamen as being far superior to any other life raft in existence. While Coast Guard and other public officials cooperated, I want to emphasize the fact that the Globe American Corporation actually provided the design, engineering, and research work to develop this raft within its own organization, and from its own private funds.

Further description would be inadequate to indicate the vast contribution to the safety of men at sea which this Globe raft has made. You would simply have to see and compare this all-steel raft with the common wooden types it has superseded, or talk with ranking

Coast Guard officers, or to sea-faring men who have been through the hell of a sinking at sea to know just what a contribution this company and this raft have made.

When Globe first offered its all-steel raft the reaction to it, as I said, was enthusiastic. But it immediately became apparent that this new type raft would inevitably destroy the business of companies who had been building and selling old-type wooden rafts. Understand, I do not intend to place charges against any private interests, or to impugn the motives of any responsible public officials in this instance. I do say to you, however, that there is every evidence that strong pressure developed very early against Globe and this new raft. Despite all the initial praises, the company encountered extreme difficulty in negotiating a satisfactory contract to supply these rafts. The merits of the case were so obvious, however, that Globe eventually was awarded a contract for 3,600 of these rafts, on which it has since been producing well ahead of allocations so that a stock pile of rafts is being built up in shipyards.

Incidentally, hundreds of our merchant ships commissioned before the all-metal raft went into production are still equipped with the old-style wooden rafts, commonly referred to by seamen as chicken crates and death traps, because the War Shipping Administration says no better life-saving gear is available. Still, here are stock piles of all-metal rafts accumulating in shipyards, awaiting the launching of new ships far in the future.

At present rate of production, however, the contract will be easily completed this summer. In the meantime, new difficulties beset the company in its efforts to secure a renewal contract. In fact, within the past 15 days the procurement officials of the Maritime Commission have placed orders with a number of different companies for a total of 1,400 wooden rafts. There is no apparent disposition at this time on the part of these officials to renew a contract with Globe for additional all-steel rafts.

What has happened to cause Maritime Commission to turn again to wooden rafts, in the face of the recommendations of the Coast Guard, and over the protests of the National Maritime Union and other independent authorities who have a right to speak on the subject? Have wooden rafts been so radically improved within the past year? In fairness it ought to be said that the newly ordered wood rafts are vast improvements over earlier types. They naturally would be, for they incorporate many improvements in raft construction pioneered by Globe. In the opinion of any fair-minded authority, however, they are still far inferior in many vital particulars to the Globe all-steel raft.

The wooden raft has several inherent weaknesses, but just consider one of them here: Its inflammability. As the result of a recent survey, which I am sure covers only a small portion of the total record of disasters, the Coast Guard reports that in the case of 34 vessels, some 100 wooden rafts were destroyed by fire. In case of

torpedoing or explosion at sea, fire is an almost inevitable consequence. Wooden lifeboats are prohibited aboard tankships, yet wooden life rafts are used. And a wooden raft is simply more kindling on the deck of a burning ship if the crew is not lucky enough to get it overboard before fire reaches it. And since the oil on the sea is almost invariably ablaze the raft becomes a funeral pyre when seamen are in it.

Granting that we ought to entertain such a question even for a minute where human lives depend upon the inherent safety of a raft, are the wooden rafts cheaper? The base price of the Globe raft on the present contract is \$960. Since that contract was let, added equipment and supplies have brought the unit price up to \$1,180. But please understand, this increased cost covers such items as sealed cartons of emergency rations, containers of pure water, fishing tackle, signal flares, and so forth, and so forth.

Now how do the prices on the wood rafts recently contracted compare? Well, the cheapest wooden raft is to cost approximately \$1,200 per unit, and prices range from that figure on up to \$1,450 per unit.

There is an interesting sidelight to this story of the all-steel raft which I want to point out to you. In perfecting the new type raft, Globe found that the old style launching way was as pitifully inadequate as the old style wood raft, itself. Many a wooden raft had been lost off shipboard in rough seas, or had been made perfectly useless for any emergency because it had been necessary to lash the raft down on the way in such a manner that it could never be quickly launched. Working on that phase of the problem, Globe perfected a really safe, foolproof new launching way. On this way, the steel raft is always held rigidly and securely under every condition except actual sinking. On the Globe way, the raft may be launched manually right at the way. Positive provision is also made so that the raft may be launched by remote control from the bridge of the ship, or any other safe spot where controls may be installed. And, finally, in case a sinking should be so swift that neither manual nor remote control could be operated, positive provision is made so that the raft will be released automatically and float clear of the ship as it goes down, readily available to any survivors.

The tremendous value of such a device ought to be obvious at a glance even to a layman. You would think that the company making such a contribution should, in simple justice, receive a good portion of any contracts for these new ways which it is equipped to produce. But after Globe completed all the plans and specifications for this new launching way at its own expense and turned them over without reservation or condition to the Government, How do you think it fared in the first contracts let? Contracts were negotiated for ways for 238 Victory ships with Globe and two other companies. Globe was awarded 72. The other two companies were awarded 63 and 84 each. And these other com-

panies are using Globe plans and specifications.

But that is by no means the only time Globe has been treated rather roughly by the Maritime Commission in the matter of contract distribution. Remember that Globe exclusively pioneered the all-steel raft and put it into production with 100-percent private-capital investment. Globe has amply demonstrated its ability to fulfill its contract agreements and to meet maritime requirements. Notwithstanding, however, the Maritime Commission caused to be set up on the west coast at Los Angeles another company to build the identical Globe all-metal raft. Into this second company, through the United States Maritime Commission and Defense Plant Corporation, went some \$370,000 of the American people's money for new facilities merely to duplicate the capacity of the Globe organization.

Let me emphasize here the very vital point that Los Angeles, where this second plant was installed, has been the very heart of the most critical labor-shortage area from the outset of this war production program. On the other hand, my home city of Kokomo, Ind., is not and has never been classified by the War Manpower Commission as an area of critical labor shortage. The Globe Co. was already set up and in operation. Its organization was skilled and experienced, and there was no labor-recruiting problem, such as the plant on the west coast was bound to face.

If present policy stands, Globe will face the inevitable necessity of laying off perhaps as many as 600 or 700 people this summer; 589 subcontractors, now working with Globe, will face sharp reduction of output or the complete loss of their contracts. Within my home city alone, Globe is receiving materials and services from 106 different subcontractors. The loss, therefore, is not going to be limited to the 600 or 700 Globe workers and their families. It is also going to be felt by 106 companies, large and small, right within that single community.

Why this deliberate violation of common sense, this large waste of public money merely to duplicate already existing facilities provided by private initiative? Why this discriminatory distribution of Government business which threatens seriously to work hardship upon this organization of a thousand people who have made such a great contribution to our war effort? Finally, why this threatened injury to a community in which this Globe organization is such an important part, and the apparent disregard by public procurement officials for the safety of the lives of the men who sail our ships?

There seems to be no sensible answer to these questions, unless it be that there are serious irregularities within these Federal agencies. The matter is so serious, so vital, that it deserves the most thorough investigation. The chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Judge BLAND, has already expressed to me his own keen interest in this situation. I urge, how-

ever, that the House acquaint itself with the facts.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. This morning I received a letter from Admiral Land saying that a full investigation is being made in connection with this matter and that the report should be ready for submission within a week. That was based on the letter which the gentleman from Indiana was kind enough to send to me.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think it only fair to express to the gentleman from Virginia the appreciation not only of myself but of the people involved in this controversy for his active interest in this problem. I know that Judge BLAND, the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and one of the outstanding Members of this House, is vitally interested in protecting the laws of the seamen who sail our merchant ships. I hope that he will go to the bottom of the matter and force the Maritime Commission to fully explain its action in the procurement of life rafts and to correct what appears to be a discrimination against an industry and a shameful disregard for the safety of our seamen.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, an examination of the report of the committee which brings this bill before the House today indicates that the committee has reduced the amount of appropriations \$61,872,796 below the 1944 appropriation. The committee has reduced the amount of the bill \$69,463,386 below the Budget estimate.

I direct your attention to the effort on the part of the committee to economize. The amount of the reduction is significant in view of the fact that the major portion of the appropriation is mandatory in order to finance the Federal portion of joint State and Federal programs. There is involved in this bill provision for financing the social-security program, involving old-age and survivors' insurance; Federal contributions for old-age assistance; unemployment compensation and various maternal and child-welfare programs; apprentice training and vocational education programs, as well as education and public health services. Therefore an examination of the bill will clearly disclose that the opportunity for great reductions in the amount of the estimates is impossible. When the committee, after carefully analyzing and scrutinizing every budgetary estimate, has succeeded in reducing the amount of the appropriation sixty-nine million dollars plus. I believe it is an indication that both the full committee and the subcommittee were quite mindful of the taxpayer when they reported this bill. I realize that to reduce expenses of government is a much harder thing than it would appear to the casual observer.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand, the gentleman is saying that the \$69,000,000 cut should be considered as coming out of, let us say, the \$274,000,000 of estimates in the items for "other than for uncontrollable grants-in-aid and other mandatory items."

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Therefore, as a percentage cut—and that is not always an intelligent figure, but it is one that we use in discussion—what would be the cut?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not believe you can designate the reductions in Budget items percentagewise, because you will observe that involved in this cut, for instance, is a reduction in the amount of allocation of funds to the State for the payment of the administration of unemployment compensation. There may be other items in the bill of that character. The gentleman knows that funds, for instance, to pay for the administration of unemployment compensation are paid in to the Federal Treasury by virtue of Federal taxes. We as a Congress have to reappropriate that money out of the Treasury, and it is allocated by the Social Security Board to the various States to pay the administration expense of unemployment compensation. The amount that we must appropriate is the actual amount that is necessary to carry on that administration. Likewise, the amount necessary to pay the requirements of old-age and survivors insurance must be appropriated for. It is true that the committee has some discretion as to whether or not it will appropriate the full amount which is requested by the Social Security Board, and there is an opportunity for the exercise of a little discretion in the amount of the appropriation; but, by and large, if we are to maintain our function, which Congress has provided for in organic law, we must appropriate ultimately either in this appropriation or in supplemental appropriations the amount of money that is necessary to pay old-age and survivors insurance, to pay the Federal contribution for old-age pensions, and to pay the amount necessary for the administration of unemployment compensation.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. If the gentleman will examine page 2 of the report he will find that the total aggregate of the bill is \$1,104,972,514, and of this \$215,623,129 is for national-defense items.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Seven hundred and ninety-eight million three hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars is funds which are made mandatory by law. This leaves only \$90,967,385 representing funds appropriated for administrative expenses or for cost of directing Federal activities which are subject to some control. We did cut some of the national defense administration expenses in the bill. The total cuts were \$69,000,000. I

think that gives the picture in a nutshell.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further, I merely wanted to emphasize, if I understood the gentleman correctly, his statement that this committee has made a very careful scrutiny of the items in this bill, as shown by the very heavy cuts made in the items in the interest of economy where cuts were possible.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that we do not know what this bill will look like when it comes back from the other body, but at least in its present form it shows a determined and a unanimous effort upon the part of the subcommittee to eliminate from the functions of government those things which are not absolutely essential to the operations of the civil affairs of government and to carrying on the war effort.

I know there will be some agencies of Government that will feel that we have been unduly stringent in the exercise of the spirit of economy. Nevertheless it should be apparent by now to those in the executive and administrative agencies of government that there must be a time when these unnecessary expenditures of government will have to be eliminated, and that includes personnel and administration and everything that goes with it.

It is a very difficult job sitting on the Committee on Appropriations and having the benefit only of the justifications of the people that are asking for the money. We may make a mistake. We may cut too much off one agency of the Government or not cut another agency of Government enough. I can say that this committee has unanimously and honestly tried to bring to the Congress a bill that every Member of Congress can support and which will represent a real step in the direction of economy in the expenditure of public funds.

When the war agencies bill was before this House I spoke at some length in an effort to do away with duplication of effort in Government activities. I did not get anywhere. I was told that I made a good presentation before the Committee on Appropriations and made a good presentation on the floor of the House, but when the vote was taken I found myself frustrated, as I have been many times since I have been a Member of this Congress. An honest and an intelligent effort to try to do away with duplicating agencies of Government was destroyed by the usual tactics of chest-beating and arm waving in the well of the House and the argument that to destroy any of these functions or to curtail them would hinder the war effort. That is a familiar thing, that I have listened to for a long time, where all these agencies of Government try to climb under the tent of the war effort. Almost every one of them, without exception, has set out a separate budget for national-defense activities, so that we have the regular budget for their regular activities and then we have a separate budget for their national-defense activities, and the money all goes into one pot and is administered by the same administrator,

and it is spent. It might just as well be included in the regular Budget except that the story is that "Maybe we will be able to cut it down some after the war by keeping these items in a separate budget known as the national-defense budget."

I could take the time if I wanted to and call your attention to the national-defense budgets in the various agencies covered by this appropriation bill and the supplemental appropriations that are contained in deficiency bills reported on the floor of the House, only to find those deficiency items coming back the next year in the regular appropriation bill and forming the basis for an increase in the regular appropriation.

Every member of the Committee on Appropriations knows that technique, and how it has been used in an attempt to build up agencies of Government and build personnel and build up the total of appropriations.

I tried as hard as I knew how to bring the question squarely before the Congress and, as I said a few moments ago, I felt frustrated. It has happened so often. When you try to cut out something that has become implanted in the Government down here with a whole group of people on the pay roll, it is extremely difficult to eliminate it—justification will always be found in the record. With few exceptions, however, the hearings are silent except as they report the arguments made by the bureau heads who are asking for the money. Yet we stand up here day in and day out and say, "Turn to the record, turn to the justifications, turn to page so-and-so of the hearings and there you will find the justification for this appropriation."

The only thing you will find in the hearings, gentlemen, and the only thing you will find in the justifications, is the story that has been built up by the agency itself in an attempt to justify its request for money.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to yield to my good friend from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Four or five years ago I advocated the appropriation of \$1,000,000 to get a special, permanent, investigating committee during the year to go into every department to prevent overlapping and the appropriation of money which is not necessary. Where did I get? Even the Committee on Appropriations did not approve of it, nor did the House approve of it. If you want to save money that is the way to save it, by appropriating a million dollars and saving probably \$100,000,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

I may say to my distinguished friend from New York that it is well known I have taken a similar position for a number of years since I have had the privilege of serving upon the Committee on Appropriations. I feel so helpless, sitting upon a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and having

placed in front of me one of these bills together with a stack of justifications 3 feet high, which you see for the first time, that is, most of them, when you come up to the committee meeting. And there arrayed on the other side of the table are all the experts of the agency who are interested in getting approval of their justifications. How helpless I feel, at times, in the face of the great wisdom and knowledge which these people have and which we as members of a subcommittee dealing with the whole scope of the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency and related independent offices are supposed to have. We are supposed to have knowledge of the intricate, inside, detailed workings of all these agencies and departments of Government. When the hearings are held, each one of those agencies has its experts who are only concerned with the particular item in which they are interested. There they are, and, say, can they always make a beautiful story to justify every dollar of expenditure that they ask for. Personally they are a lot of fine men, and I think most of them are trying to do a good job, but they in turn are up against the same situation sometimes that the members of the committee are up against. I want to challenge the attention of this Congress and the people of this Nation to the fact that sometime, somewhere, unreasonable and unnecessary expenditures of public funds must stop if we are to protect the solvency of the Nation. Only such money as is absolutely vital and necessary to carry on the war and to provide for necessary public functions should be appropriated. If you go through this estimate you will see all these agencies that have been set up in connection with the national-defense item that are expending or have expended hundreds of millions of dollars. Just take one little item. I have no prepared speech, but I am sincerely trying to arouse opinion here and in the country. Take the item, I think it was \$25,000,000, set up in the Office of Education to provide training for men in industry at college levels and college grades, a program set up by the various colleges of the country—\$25,000,000. Well, all I know about it is that the Budget approved it and says it is all right. Here is a justification for it, as it comes before the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know any member of the subcommittee who has ever gone out into the field to see how it is working or how it is being handled. You have just got to take the word of the people who come in there. Who comes in? Whom do you hear? You do not hear anybody except the people who are interested in that particular matter.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HARE. The gentleman made a suggestion there which I feel is very pertinent. I have felt for several years that members of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations should find the time somewhere to go into the field and make a study and investigate and see to what extent these appropriations are being judiciously used. That

has been attempted a few times and we have been confronted with this criticism: The committee is off on a junket. It seems to me probably the fear of criticism of being on a junket sometimes prevents the committee from going out and thoroughly discharging the duties of such a committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one more question?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Bearing out your statement as to finding out how the money is spent, on vocational education 8 or 9 years ago I asked the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Studebaker, how they knew the different States spent the amount of money that we matched 50-50. He said they took the word of the States for it and that there was not any investigation made whatever to find out whether the States matched that 50 percent or not. You will see that in the hearings some 7 or 8 years ago.

Mr. KEEFE. I would not think that would be exactly accurate today, as I understand the procedure. The allocations, as I understand it, under the vocational education program, are made to the States and they are administered by the States. That is as it should be.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I agree with you there.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that the Federal Government does lay down rules and regulations as to the expenditure of that money and does audit the accounts of the States in connection with the expenditure to see to it that the expenditures are made in accordance with law. That is all I know about it. Whether it is being done that way or not, I do not know.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They audit the accounts, but they do not send anybody into the field to see whether or not that money was spent.

Mr. KEEFE. The point I am trying to make, and if you will pardon me just 1 minute until I get this point across, if I can, is this: I referred to the \$25,000,000 appropriation for the giving of supplemental courses at college grade to men in industry to be carried on by the various colleges of the country. I do not want to appear to be opposing the effort of the colleges in that regard, but all I know about it is what Dean Potter and another gentleman who came before the committee told us. Upon examination, I found what they did was to turn the funds over to the various colleges of the country. The funds were actually disbursed out into the treasuries of the colleges and they managed the program and they spent the money. They set up the courses and they got people to come in and take these courses—a sort of extension system around the various States. Then, at the end of the year, they would figure up how much they had received, how much had been spent, and it would show they had \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 on hand that had not been spent out of the \$25,000,000 appropriation.

I said to the gentleman, "Why can this appropriation not be reduced to \$12,000,000 if you only spent \$12,000,000 this

year?" "Oh, no! That would not do." They had some nebulous reason as to why they had to have this \$25,000,000 scattered around in the treasuries of the various colleges of the country, in order to assure the professors who were devoting themselves to the program that they would be sure to get their pay on time, and that the expense would be paid on time. I raised the question then—and it is a question in my mind now—whether or not we are properly and jealously guarding the taxpayers' money when we permit appropriations to be used in that manner and to be scattered around the country into the treasuries of these various organizations, to have them spend it out of their treasuries as they see fit to spend it, and turn back to the Treasury of the United States such sums as they have been unable to spend.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am in accord and agreement with the contention of the gentleman from Wisconsin that unnecessary governmental expenditures should be reduced. I am wondering if the gentleman would not agree with me, and with practically all Members of the House, that there is a theory today among certain leaders in governmental agencies, that regardless of the amount of our Federal debt, we can wipe off that indebtedness. There is that theory going around. I do not believe this Government, or this Congress wants anyone to believe for a moment that we incur a debt and that we do not mean to pay for it eventually.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] that if I did not believe the United States Government was fundamentally sound and that we not only intended to pay but will pay our debts, I would not think that the struggle which we are making in the world today would be worth the sacrifice of blood and tears that is taking place. I am one of those who has stated from this floor time and again that despite what anyone may say, under proper direction and leadership this country can work itself out and will do so. But there will be no easy way in which that can be accomplished.

Now, let me illustrate again, if I may, for just a moment. During the consideration of the war effort and these national-defense appropriations, and especially these programs that were designed to give training to men in arts and industry and so on, it was an easy thing to come before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and justify tremendous expenditures of money, and perhaps a large part of it has been wisely and judiciously expended, and it has been perhaps worth while. But they always hook on a lot of other things.

One of them I never could see was the so-called visual aids for war training, under which the Office of Education went out into the motion-picture field and

hired legitimate motion-picture producers to produce a lot of lantern slides and films, visual-aid program. Then what happened?

Out of the appropriation made, the Government paid for the making of these slides and films. The idea was that they were to be used as visual education out in the field, in the factories, and in the shops, and in the vocational schools, I presume. Then according to the testimony, as I recall it, they turned over the distribution of this material to a private film-distributing agency, which had been in the educational-film business for many years and had its agents scattered all over the country, so that anybody who wanted to get these visual aids would have to buy them through this private film agency. Now what is the Government doing in that business? If there is a field for the successful presentation of visual aids of that character, why are not the regular private agencies that are in the film producing and distribution business capable of handling the situation? Oh, they have a good reason and a good excuse, but after the hearing the committee decided they had had enough of that, and we cut it out entirely. You will notice that appropriation is entirely eliminated.

You will also note, if you study this thing carefully, that one or two of the duplicate agencies to which I referred the other day when we were considering the war agencies appropriation bill, have been eliminated in this appropriation bill. I say to you I do not think that is the way to do it. As I stated at that time, I think we should have a consolidation of those agencies where matters pertaining to labor are in the Labor Department and not 15 or 20 agencies of Government dealing with problems relating to labor and management policies and practices.

I will also say to my distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] that I have made the suggestion times without number that I can see no good reason, for example, why the Children's Bureau should be in the Department of Labor, and why it should not be in the Federal Security Agency, in the Office of Public Health Service. Simply because under the law it may be charged with the fundamental responsibility of enforcing the provisions of the child-labor law is no reason to put it in the Labor Department. I believe the proper place for the Children's Bureau, which is largely concerned with maternal aids and children's aids, and child welfare and health sanitation, is in the Public Health Service. I cannot understand why that agency should not be within the general scope of the Public Health Service, in the expenditure of funds for those purposes.

We have a long way to go to bring about orderly return to peacetime activities in government. That problem is going to be just as severe as the problem of returning to peacetime activity in industry. We ought to be thinking about it a little. We ought to see if we cannot place those functions where they belong, and, by consolidation, wipe out

duplication of effort and duplication of Federal expense.

Your committee, in the handling of this bill, has tried to do its best. We are not a legislative committee. I am only making these suggestions so that perhaps someone may read what is being stated, and the germ of an idea might be generated into activity.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It seems to me that what the gentleman has said, and the comments from the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], reveal an inferiority complex on the part of the Congress in providing for its own needs, which is harmful to the best working of Congress. The Congress is afraid to appropriate money to provide help for itself. The Congress is afraid to appropriate money to spend on travel, to provide personal knowledge for Members of Congress, of the activities of the Government.

If the gentleman will yield further, I talked in the past week with a Federal bureaucrat who was formerly a Congressman. He said:

Now, when I need information to carry on my work I have somebody I can call on who reports to me and me alone. When I want to take a trip on official business to find out something about my job I take it; when I want to send somebody I send him, and you fellows on the Hill furnish me the money to do it. But—

He said—

you will not furnish yourselves with the same sort of service that you are willing to furnish me and, therefore, since none of you are omniscient, you cannot find out what you need to find out to perform your duties intelligently.

Here I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations and I pick up today three volumes of hearings of 1,643 pages. The Committee on Appropriations carry on their hearings in executive session. I had no way to find out about this until now. I attempt to listen to these remarks, as I always do, of the distinguished gentleman who is now addressing us and I find that he and the members of the committee have not the sort of information on this gigantic bill that is needed to pass on it with full intelligent judgment. I urge the gentleman and his committee whom we hold responsible in this to appropriate the money to bring in legislation so that the Members of Congress can perform their duties intelligently and save their time and the taxpayers' money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 additional minutes.

We have developed a rather interesting avenue of discussion which may lead to the ultimate benefit of the Congress. I have never had illusions about my service on the Appropriations Committee. If there is any member of this Congress who has a mentality sufficient to grasp all of the ramifications involved in an appropriation bill such as we have right here involving \$1,104,000,000, then, as someone once said, he is a

"better man than I." I have worked as diligently and devotedly as any person in this Congress ever worked in an effort to try to understand and know the problems that ought to be brought to this Congress growing out of a multifarious list of items in an appropriation bill such as are contained here.

Then, each member of this Appropriations Committee is compelled to serve or does serve upon another subcommittee perhaps involving the same sort of situation. In this bill you will see for instance in the Public Health Service that we provide appropriations for hospitals all over the country, down here at Lexington, down in Texas, and so on, and I have never seen one of them and I do not think a member of the subcommittee has ever seen one of them. We have to take somebody's word for it. Thank God, I have so much confidence in Dr. Parran and the Public Health Service that I feel I can take their word; but on the other hand I fail in my duty to the people I represent unless I can get adequate and proper knowledge concerning these things for which we appropriate the people's money; and so those who are critical of the Appropriations Committee must understand that we are doing the best job we know how with the limited facilities we have at hand. Some of these subcommittees do get out into the field, especially those dealing with the Army and the Navy; but here is a subcommittee that has never had time or opportunity to investigate a single one of the items, so far as I know, involved in this bill. I have made some effort individually, but there ought to be a concerted and a direct effort made so that when these bills come here and they talk about the narcotics hospital down at Lexington I will know what they are talking about and so will you. To date it is just a title in the bill.

Remember that a large portion of this bill is represented by appropriations which are made pursuant to laws enacted by this Congress by which we are required to extend aid to the States in these various programs. I am willing to take the word of the men who are administering these programs as far as I can; it is all I can do if the program is going along and is decently handled.

While I am on this subject may I say I do not like to refer to every man who is in public service as a bureaucrat. I have found in my contact with the people in these agencies, the Federal Security Agency and the Labor Department, hundreds and hundreds of the finest men and women giving their lives to the work, people who are career people, who have been there for years, who are giving their lives in an effort to perform a real public service. I may say to you that in many of these old-line agencies of the Government there are some of the finest characters it has been my privilege to meet. So we cannot refer to everyone in the Government always as being a bureaucrat and imbued with bureaucratic power. But what we do need is a closer spirit of cooperation between these newer agencies of Government and the Congress of the United States so that

they are not all the time trying to fool somebody. I know that some of these appropriation items, even though they have passed the scrutiny of the Budget Bureau, are high enough so that the agency, despite the reduction we may make, will have even more funds than they hoped to get. I am inclined to believe that some agencies purposely place the amount higher than their needs, figuring that the Congress will cut the amount, and thus be able to spend as much as is necessary in any event. Again, people should get over the idea that when a cut is made in an appropriation the committee has stuck a dagger in the back of the agency, as has been sometimes said in the case of the National Labor Relations Board and some other agencies. I recall 2 years ago when we reduced an appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board that at the end of the year they had an unexpended balance twice as large as the cut. They could not spend the amount of money we gave them. This year they are asking for fewer employees, fewer jobs than we gave them last year; still there are people who say that the Congress is trying to destroy the effectiveness of the National Labor Relations Board. I think the Congress is trying to do a pretty fair job with all of these agencies, dealing with the material we have to deal with by way of evidence and justification.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. I have enjoyed and benefited from the fine constructive talk the gentleman from Wisconsin has made; but does not the gentleman believe it is about time that Congress appointed committees to sit in with these different bureaus and determine for themselves the amount of money they ought to spend, the amount of money they need? I never yet have heard of a bureau turning back any money into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say this to the gentleman: I want to be perfectly fair; the agencies of Government are required to make up their estimates and first clear them through the Budget. That means they must go down there jointly and severally to the Bureau of the Budget and make their presentation there. How long it takes I do not know; I have never been granted the privilege of knowing the inside workings and operation of the Budget Bureau, but I am told they have to spend a lot of their time running down to the Bureau of the Budget to justify their efforts. When the Bureau of the Budget has finally passed upon it and the Budget is presented to the Congress by the President, they have to come up before the subcommittee of the House that is in charge of that appropriation. That takes days and sometimes weeks and months before that is finished. Then when they have completed the hearings before the House, they are required to go over to the Senate and repeat the program. In the midst of all this business, there may be two or three supplemental appropriations sent down by the Bureau of the Budget that will require them to come before the subcom-

mittee again. If we are now going to establish another committee before whom these agencies of the Government must keep coming in order to justify appropriations, I am afraid we shall have to hire somebody to do their work, for they will not have time to do any work except justify appropriations. What I think should be adopted is the suggestion that has been repeatedly made by the distinguished gentleman from New York and others. We should have facilities available all the time, not just a few part-time investigators to run down and look at some one little item which somebody raises a question about. We should have a group serving our committee who would sit in on these Budget hearings, who would sit in with the Budget officers of the department, who would sit in as a representative of John Q. Public, and be able to bring in some facts to the committee which would enable the committee to determine whether or not the appropriation is proper.

Mr. PITTENGER. That suggestion is exactly what I had in mind.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased indeed to have the opportunity of following the distinguished gentleman who has just addressed the Committee. It seems to me the thing that he is emphasizing to the Committee is this: Bureaucracy must grow and feed upon itself if it is to continue to exist. No bureaucracy or bureau of government can continue to exist unless it does grow.

In the few minutes available to me I want to discuss briefly a bureau of the Government that has grown considerably since its inception and, if I may, to suggest a remedy, to which I hope the House in the near future will give serious consideration. The Government, of course, has grown out of all bounds. I have been impressed with the fact that as a Congressman I am really no more than a glorified chore boy who goes with hat in hand to some agency or bureau and asks: "Please, may certain of my constituents get certain services they desire." That is more or less true of the Government as it exists today. The Congress should assert itself and determine what is best for the country—not bureaus.

The departments concerned who ask for more and more money have a selfish motive. It is their job.

I want to discuss with you very briefly today the Children's Bureau. It was mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. Let us take a few short minutes to look at the Children's Bureau. The first legislation creating the Children's Bureau was introduced in 1906. The Congress passed a law in 1912 which established the Children's Bureau and at that time it was given an appropriation of \$25,640. There were 15 people in that Bureau. But like all bureaus it has grown. It has taken on

new activities of health. In fact it is a health department which duplicates existing services.

Here is what the Children's Bureau will do today: It takes care of the maternal child health problems of the Nation. It has a Crippled Children's Division and in that Crippled Children's Division they take care of rheumatic hearts. This is a part of the Labor Department, Mr. Chairman. Here is a division that takes care of crippled children and rheumatic hearts. Remember anyone is a child under 21 years. The Labor Department also has an industrial health division which has been growing by leaps and bounds. The bureau comes before the committee and justifies its requests for funds and, in my opinion, it is doing very good work. But here is where the difficulty comes in: The work that the Children's Bureau is doing is also being done by the United States Public Health Service. There is a duplication of effort and activity.

It seems to me that the Congress, at some time in the near future, should give serious consideration to the question of combining all of the activities of the Children's Bureau under the United States Public Health Service.

I introduced a bill several months ago in the Congress which has recently been referred to a committee. I hope we may have hearings very shortly. This bill has for its purpose the consolidation of all health activities. The Children's Bureau when it was first set up was set up to handle such problems as child labor, orphanage, mortality among children, hours of labor, and so forth. It should still continue to do that job. It is a job for the Children's Bureau. But why should they be dealing in problems of industrial health? Why should they have the maternal health problem? Why should they have the Crippled Children's Division?

Mr. Chairman, I was the State health director in Nebraska for over a year and a half, and I am speaking from experience. I was confused and amazed when I went in as health director to find out that we had two bureaus of government doing the same health work. These two divisions are jealous of each other, they all want to expand their activities. We accepted thousands and thousands of dollars from the Children's Bureau to put on a program of vaccination among children, a very fine program, but that is also being done by the United States Public Health Service. Why not put it all under one control? We also had an industrial health division. There are 38 States now that have industrial health divisions in their health departments, yet the Labor Bureau is asking for money for a full grown industrial health division in the Labor Department. This should all be done by one department of health, and preferably the United States Public Health Service.

Remember, the Children's Bureau was started first in 1912 with 15 people and an appropriation of \$25,600. Now they get millions of dollars, and I do not know how many employees they have on the pay roll. They go out to the various States. The State health departments

have to keep two sets of books, one for the Labor Department and one for the United States Public Health Service. They have nurses in each division, they have social workers and planners that go around the country under each division to set up paralleling programs of health, programs that ought to be under one division.

In connection with the bill I introduced I wrote to all the State health directors, because I wanted to find out how they felt about the matter. They have to make the program operate in the various States. I have heard from 36 State health directors and all but one indicated that it would greatly help the work in the State if they would put all the health activities under one head, preferably under the United States Public Health Service.

I am pointing this out to the committee, because I feel the time has arrived to evaluate these health programs so the confusion and duplication can be eliminated. It is in the interest of the public. It is all the taxpayers' money that we are spending and it is my belief that the time has arrived when we should not only think of the taxpayers' money but of those things that are in the best interest of the public and the public health. It seems to me that the next time the committee considers some of these bills it might well think of combining these activities.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I am glad the gentleman discusses this question and I am pleased to advise that it is a matter which has given the committee some concern. However, this is an appropriation committee, not a legislative committee. For 2, 3, or 4 years we have called the matter to the attention of both the Public Health Service representatives and the Children's Bureau representatives to get an expression as to the advisability of reorganizing or consolidating these two activities. But it is difficult to get a commitment from either one. It is my judgment the initiative will have to be taken by a legislative committee, and I am interested and will be interested in the outcome of the bill to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for his comment. I realize it is a legislative matter but I wanted to bring it before this committee in the hope that some legislation might be brought in which will combine these various activities because it does make for confusion and misunderstanding and for a much poorer health program within the States to have two agencies paralleling each other in their work. The Children's Bureau will not want the transfer but the Congress must decide these issues. It is in the interest of better public health it should be done.

The other thing I want to discuss is the E. M. I. C. Some day that is going to have to be stopped. I am concerned because some of the physicians of the country are perplexed on account of the rules and regulations under which the program is operating.

Some of the better physicians of the country just will not bother with the red tape and the forms that have to be filled out in order to take care of the individual under the E. M. I. C. program. The girl does not really have the free choice of her physician. If she had \$75, \$85, or \$100 to spend—I understand it is costing about \$75 a case now—she could go to her own physician and say, "Doctor, I am going to have a baby. I wish you would take care of me without the red tape they have now," and she would get better service. She would feel better mentally. She would feel that she was getting personal attention.

As it is now you are going to find many of these girls not getting personal attention. Some of the better men are just too busy with the red tape and other details of the program to take care of some of these cases.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand the gentleman is advocating that the Government pay an allotment or allowance directly to the mother or prospective mother to spend as she pleases?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think it would have to be payment direct to the mother, but I think the mother ought to have the free choice of the physician that she would like to go to.

Mr. KEEFE. This law specifically provides that she has that free choice and she can go to the physician of her choice.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true, but I will say to the gentleman, because of the red tape involved in the handling of these cases now, the best physicians of the country say, "I am sorry; I am just too busy with other cases. You go to John Jones; he is not so busy. He can take care of your case."

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will read the hearings upon that matter, which were rather extensive, I think he will disabuse his mind of the fact that there is any very extended failure on the part of the medical fraternity of this country to take care of these women. There are a few isolated cases where so-called specialists, who charge large fees for handling their patients, do object to taking care of a patient for the fee which we normally pay to the ordinary practitioner. But experience indicates that that type of practitioner would not be taking care of these people anyway in the absence of this program. As a matter of fact, I may say to the gentleman, from my observation and from contact with physicians in local areas, they are very well satisfied with this program. They are getting their bills paid, and the hospitals are getting their bills paid, and that might not be the case if we were to make an allotment direct to the mother.

Would the gentleman suggest that we make the allotment direct to the mother before or after the child was born?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not suggest that we make it direct to the mother, but make it available to her so

that she could go to the physician she wanted.

The gentleman says the physicians were satisfied. I happen to have in my office some 10 resolutions from 10 different medical societies who are condemning the program, so it is not all satisfactory. I want these girls to have the best possible care. I want to eliminate the red tape.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will find all of those resolutions set out in full in the testimony that was taken. They are all in the record.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am pleased to know they are there. I have not had time to read them. I do think that the Children's Bureau has demanded too many reports and details—it thus discourages not only the physician but the expectant mother. I think one reason some 140,000 mothers did not take advantage of the program last year might be laid to red tape and details demanded. Others did not need financial help.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Of course, at the time this aid to mothers was considered in the Committee on Ways and Means—and I think the basic and fundamental rules were established by that committee—I remember that we tried and succeeded, I am sure, in permitting the administration of the law to be centered almost entirely in the various States.

In my State of Michigan, so far as the soldiers' wives are concerned, I know that the medical fraternity prescribes the standards, and I believe even passes upon the availability of the physician to minister to these women under these circumstances. If there is any deficiency there, it seems to me probably the medical fraternity is rightfully to blame, and not the law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman realizes that the medical profession, with some 57,000 of their number in armed forces, is pretty much limited in the extent of the services they can give at home.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman will permit an observation, I grant that that is true at the present time, but I do not think we are dealing with the present time and the present wartime emergency. We are dealing with a general situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this in reply to my friend's reference to the fact that many women have not availed themselves of the services rendered under this program. He said it was due to the fact that there was too much red tape on the part of the Children's Bureau. I disagree with that. So far as the Children's Bureau is concerned, I think red tape has been reduced to an absolute minimum.

Is there not a possibility that because of financial independence, some of these women did not fall back upon the service?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I think that to be true.

Mr. DINGELL. I think we entirely overlook some of those things and say that out of the hundreds of thousands, and probably millions of mothers, there were 100,000 who did not avail themselves of this service because of red tape. I disagree with that. One of the reasons probably was financial independence.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is quite true, although there were some that were not happy about the red tape involved. I know that because of the protests that came in.

This should be an activity for the duration of the war. If it continues and the program extended the cost will be prohibitive. We should not be doing things for people that they can do for themselves. The continued giving of money to the States outright or for matching purposes will never reduce the Federal debt or make people free and independent citizens.

Mr. HARE. I would like to invite the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this program was not inaugurated primarily for the purpose of making a gratuity to the mother. It has a two-fold objective. One was to supplement, in a way, the income of men in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps having low incomes. But the primary purpose was to give assurance to these young men who joined the armed forces, and probably would go overseas, where they would be many hundreds, possibly thousands of miles away from home, that their wives would be given good medical care in their absence. Those who framed and sponsored this legislation felt that it would be the better part of wisdom on the part of the Government to insure the soldier or the sailor or this man in the Air Corps that when he left the shores of this country, or went into the armed forces at some distance, that his wife at home would be assured of the best medical attention available. She would be assured of hospitalization and child medical care for 1 year after birth, the idea being that you would have a satisfied soldier, a satisfied sailor, or a satisfied pilot. It was to strengthen the morale of both husband and wife in his absence.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I agree with the gentleman. That is correct. I have no criticism except as there seems to be too much red tape involved for her to get the physician that she wants. The other thing I want to remind the gentleman about is this: After all, you provide for the birth of a baby but you have not provided for the other emergencies of life. The girl might get appendicitis while her husband is gone, or a broken leg, or the baby might get measles or mastoid trouble. You have gone so far in the care of the individual, why should you hesitate to take the next step?

Mr. HARE. It was not our committee that made provision for the maternity cases. That came from the legislative committee. The responsibility of our committee is only to see that the necessary funds are appropriated to carry out the will of the Congress as expressed in the law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is true, but you did appropriate money for it. If you are going to go just one step, why not take the whole step? This would be complete socialization of medicine and the people, which I oppose.

Mr. HARE. The legislative committee did not go that far, consequently we cannot go that far.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is a step to socialized medicine. It means regimentation, a lower quality of medical care. The American people are used to the best medical care. These expectant mothers should have the best, minus regimentation; a free choice of physicians should be granted these expectant mothers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill down to and including page 1, line 7.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4899) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, had come to no resolution thereon.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 4070, the independent offices appropriation bill, for the fiscal year 1945.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] be permitted to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by Constantine Brown.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered before the Polish-American Congress at Memorial Hall, Buffalo, N. Y., on May 28, 1944, entitled "Our Only Course, Our Sole Objective."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter and an unusually interesting advertise-

ment of the Cunningham Drug Stores of Detroit, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of May 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a sermon broadcast on the Church of the Air program, delivered by the Very Reverend Monsignor James H. Griffiths, chancellor to Archbishop Spellman in the military ordinarate for the armed forces, on the sixth annual memorial mass offered in the amphitheater at the Arlington National Cemetery on Sunday, May 28, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

IMPORTATION OF BEVERAGE CANE SPIRITS INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Speaker, on two previous occasions I have directed the attention of the House to the confusion and chaos which followed the promulgation of the War Production Board's order M-374 on March 9, 1944, relative to the importation of beverage cane spirits into the United States.

On those occasions I expressed the fear that the manner in which the entire problem was being handled would penalize the small importer and react to the advantage of the large and more powerful company.

Subsequent events have justified my fears and today I offer to you the evidence of discrimination and favoritism which has been shown at least one major operator in this country, namely, the Schenley organization which, as you undoubtedly know from the public press, is under indictment for operation in the black market in this country.

When I first brought this matter to the attention of the House I was of the belief that the War Production Board, which issued the order, was the agency to blame. I now find upon further investigation that the War Production Board has merely been acting as a front for the State Department which, in principle, is the Department to be charged with discrimination.

The War Production Board, it now appears, issued authorizations for the importation of beverage cane spirits to the Schenley people only after insistence and demands received from the State Department.

In importing 1,500 barrels of Martinique young rum into this country Schenley is guilty of a violation of the War Production Board order which carries with it a penal clause, and I am submitting this entire matter to the Department of Justice and asking them what they are going to do about it.

It would be interesting to know by what process Schenley becomes the fair-haired liquor importer in this country to

the detriment and disadvantage of small and less powerful importers.

It would be interesting to know why Schenley cannot only violate the law, but violate it with the blessing of the State Department.

I submit to you here the documentary proof of this violation and again ask the Department of Justice what is going to be done about it.

I hold in my hand the original order of the War Production Board, M-374, issued on March 9, 1944, which says in the opening paragraph:

It is, therefore, deemed necessary and appropriate in the public interest and to promote defense to allocate facilities for the production of beverage cane spirits (as defined in this order), and to control the importation of beverage cane spirits so as to prevent further uncontrolled diversion of sugar and molasses to the production of these spirits.

Reading from that order I quote paragraph 3 of section A, which defines what is meant by "import," and I read it to you:

Import means to transport in any manner into the continental United States from any foreign country or from any Territory or possession of the United States. It includes shipments into a free port, free zone, or bonded custody of the United States Bureau of Customs (bonded warehouse) in the continental United States and shipments in bond into the continental United States for transshipment to Canada, Mexico, or any other foreign country.

There can certainly be no doubt in anybody's mind what the meaning of import is. A child can understand the thing. I now read to you section C, which sets forth the restrictions on such imports:

Restrictions on imports of beverage cane spirits. On and after March 15, 1944, no person shall import, attempt to import, purchase for import, or make any contract or other arrangement for the importing of any beverage cane spirits without first having obtained authorization to do so from the War Production Board. This paragraph does not apply to beverage cane spirits produced in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands of the United States, or in the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska for the reason that the production of beverage cane spirits in these localities is controlled by paragraph (b) of this order. This paragraph applies to the importation of beverage cane spirits, regardless of the existence on March 15, 1944, or thereafter, of any contract or other arrangement for importation.

Can there be doubt in anybody's mind what that section says? Of course there cannot. It is in plain English, understandable to everybody.

But in order to emphasize my point I repeat the language of the first sentence, which says that—

On and after March 15, 1944, no persons shall import, attempt to import, purchase for import, or make any contract or other arrangement for the importing of any beverage cane spirits without first having obtained authorization to do so from the War Production Board.

I do not think there can be any doubt in anybody's mind about what is meant and what is ordered, yet what do we find?

On April 4, in the port of Fort de France at Martinique, there was assigned to the Schenley Corporation in defiance of this order on the French vessel *Duc de Doumle* 1,500 casks of rum, or 104,289 gallons, from a shipper, one Jean Joseph, at Martinique, consigned to the credit of the Schenley Corporation by Ittman Bros., who are brokers. I charge that Schenley did have the rum loaded on that vessel.

Is there anyone so naive as to believe that Schenley, with its long standing operations in this country and in Martinique did not know what was going on?

Is there anyone so naive as to believe that Schenley, if it did in truth desire to prevent this violation of the law and prevent the loading of this vessel could not have done so?

I might be naive, but certainly not that naive.

Keep in mind these dates because they are important.

On March 9 the War Production Board issued its restrictive order to become effective on March 15 and told the liquor importers of this country, "You cannot import into the United States, without first receiving the authorization of the War Production Board, any beverage cane spirits prohibited by this order."

It made no exceptions. It did not tell the big fellow, "You can do it," and the little fellow, "You can't." It was an over-all restriction.

Yet we have the acknowledged fact that approximately 3 weeks later, without authorization of the War Production Board and in direct violation of the War Production Board's order, in the interest of the Schenley Corporation, the first step was taken to get rum into this country. This vessel arrived in New Orleans on April 20, and on April 24 the inward manifest entered at the custom house in New Orleans showed that this consignment of rum was to the credit of the Schenley Corporation, and still there was no authorization issued by the War Production Board.

The records will show that the authorization of the War Production Board to Schenley to take this rum into this country was only issued on April 26, 1944, 26 days after the vessel had left Martinique and 6 days after it had put into the port of New Orleans.

I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, is there any doubt in anybody's mind that the law and order of the War Production Board had been clearly violated?

I now point out to you further, however, the penal clause of the order and emphasize the last sentence:

Violations: Any person who willfully violates any provision of this order, or who, in connection with this order, willfully conceals a material fact or furnishes false information to any department or agency of the United States is guilty of a crime, and upon conviction may be punished by fine or imprisonment. In addition, any person may be prohibited from making or obtaining further deliveries of or from processing or using material under priority control and may be deprived of priorities assistance.

I repeat and direct your attention to the last sentence, which says:

In addition, any person may be prohibited from making or obtaining further deliveries.

But what did actually happen? After violation of the order the Schenley Import Corporation on May 5 approximately 2 weeks after the original violation, instead of being punished for flaunting the law and disregarding the order, was further rewarded with an authorization for an additional 4,500 barrels containing 360,000 proof gallons.

Keep in mind that while Schenley was thus being allowed to import this rum into this country there were on record with the War Production Board applications representing distress cases involving approximately 300,000 gallons of rum from Mexico and 200,000 gallons of rum from Cuba.

These distress cases represented instances in which importers, prior to the effective date of the order, had already issued their letters of credit and stood a loss out of pocket if they could not get their merchandise into the country for sale.

But they could not move without the authorization of the War Production Board if they would follow the law. But the powerful Schenley Corporation was able to load its merchandise in Martinique weeks after the effective date and was able to enter this merchandise into the United States because the State Department told the War Production Board to let it in.

I ask you if that is not discrimination, then what is it?

When I first learned of this shipment I called the attention of the House to it and inquired of the War Production Board, whom I thought to be totally at fault, as to why they had authorized Schenley to come into this country with rum while at the same time denied the right to the little fellows in distress.

In reply to that inquiry I got the clue to the key of the whole situation from Mr. John Boyer, Chief of the Alcohols and Solvents Branch of the War Production Board, on May 9, when he wrote me that the order had been issued and I quote, "by the request of the State Department."

Almost simultaneous with that inquiry, Mr. George Schneider, general manager of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, inquired of the War Production Board what it was all about. On May 18, 1944, he received this answer. This answer was from Mr. D. P. Morgan, Director of Chemical Bureau of the War Production Board. I quote:

The action taken by us authorizing the import of Martinique rum by the Schenley Import Corporation was specified by officials of the State Department whose competence in the field of foreign relations we are required to recognize.

Thus we are told by the War Production Board in these two letters that they took their orders from the State Department. Why is it that while other importers were following the law and making their applications to the proper authorities in the War Production Board, the Schenley Corporation was able to go to the State Department, and through

what means I do not know—but certainly through successful means—to have the State Department tell the War Production Board to issue the authorization?

Naturally I went to the State Department to inquire. I asked them this direct question in a letter:

Did the War Production Board issue any authorization for permits to allow entry into this country of liquor affected by the embargo, with special reference to Martinique, at the insistence and demand of the State Department?

In reply to that I read now a letter which I received from the State Department, signed by Cordell Hull, who, of course, only signed the prepared letter because my question was directed to Mr. Courtney Brown, with whom I also discussed the matter personally. I read you the answer:

Order M-374 was never looked upon as establishing an embargo on the importation of cane beverage spirits, but it did have that effect for some time after it first became effective. This threatened to cause the loss of shipping opportunities, which are rather infrequent, for some rum which was ready for shipment to the United States from Martinique when M-374 became effective on March 15. Requests to relieve this situation were made to the Department both by French officials here and by the American consulate in Martinique. Consequently, officers of the Department advised the Administrator of M-374 orally that the Department believed it desirable to permit the importation of the rum which was awaiting shipment at the time the control order became effective if such importation would not give unfair advantage to particular importers. It was pointed out that the quantity involved would not bring 1944 shipments above the quantity shipped during 1943. It was recommended that an interim quota of 535,000 proof gallons be established for the French West Indies to cover shipments which needed to be made promptly. It should be noted that this interim quota is not an addition to the quota of 1,460,000 gallons which was announced on April 30, because the 1,480,000 quota covers all shipments of young cane beverage spirits for the entire calendar year 1944.

Now, is not that an amazing explanation? The Department of State orally advised the Administrator of M-374 that it was desirable to permit the importation of the rum which was awaiting shipment at the time, if such importation would not give unfair advantage to particular importers.

How can the importation of the rum be awaiting shipment at the time the order became effective when it was only placed on the boat in Martinique on April 4 and the order became effective 3 weeks before that, on March 15? How about the rum in Mexico and Cuba against which little American importers had issued letters of credit before the order became effective and still cannot get their merchandise into this country?

The big, powerful, influential Mr. Schenley, under indictment in the black market, can get his merchandise through with the approval and approbation of the State Department. The little, helpless, law-abiding citizen not under indictment cannot even get recognition from the State Department, much less have the State Department tell the W. P. B. to issue him an authorization for his merchandise.

And I call your attention to the adroit defense of the State Department's protective sentence which justifies the importation, provided it does not give unfair advantage to particular importers. What does this authorization do if it does not give unfair advantage to Schenley, who is able to bring this merchandise into this country for sale, while the little fellows sit idly by and twiddle their thumbs, unable to get their product on the public market?

I submit to you it is an unfair advantage whether the stuff comes from Martinique, Hindustan, or the Garden of Eden. The fact remains that Schenley is allowed to bring the goods into the United States and sell it, while others in a less fortunate and less influential position are denied the same rights and privileges.

I think it also important to note that the State Department, even at the time it told the War Production Board to let Schenley in with his rum, had not yet set the quota on Martinique, because this quota was only made public on April 30, along with the quotas for young cane beverage spirits in other countries.

I have examined and reexamined the War Production Board's order, and nowhere do I find in that order which was given to the public, and those not in a position to know the inner workings of obtaining authorization, does this order say in any part that the State Department has the right to orally instruct or request the War Production Board to issue any authorization.

As a matter of fact the State Department is not even mentioned in the order, and the procedure for obtaining authorization is clearly set forth in paragraph K which says that all applications for authorization should be transmitted to the Chemicals Bureau of the War Production Board, and does not say a thing about going to the State Department for authorization.

Apparently there is one set of rules for one group and another set of rules for another group. It obviously depends on who is making the application for the authorization.

So much for the documentary evidence. Now let me tell you what actually happened in this case.

Schenley attempted to get an authorization from the War Production Board to import these liquors and was turned down. In defiance of this refusal they actually imported the stuff into the United States and landed it at New Orleans and were again refused authorization by the War Production Board, which took the position that it could not treat in one manner, Schenley the powerful operator, and allow Schenley to bring in merchandise, while at the same time refuse others in distress from bringing in their product from Mexico and Cuba.

Despite the War Production Board's refusal to authorize this shipment, the State Department told the War Production Board to issue the order and the order was issued.

Then what happened. Park & Tilford, another powerful liquor importer in the United States, heard about the transaction and charged the State Department with discrimination and pointed

out that Schenley had been allowed to take some stuff in from Martinique while they, Park & Tilford, had been denied the same privilege. So, in appeasement, and in order to soothe Park & Tilford, the State Department on May 3 told the War Production Board to issue an order to Park & Tilford for 3,000 barrels, or double the amount which had been given Schenley. Who then could charge discrimination?

Had not Park & Tilford been given twice as much as Schenley? But that is not the end of the story. One week later Schenley went back and got an order for 4,500 more barrels and then apparently and obviously for good measure, to demonstrate there was no discrimination against the little fellow, an order was issued to Seggernam-Nixon for 200 barrels, and an order for 150 barrels to the Wine Shippers Import Corporation.

Compare these insignificant sums, however, to the 6,000 barrels given Schenley, who defied the order of the War Production Board and violated the law and delivered its merchandise without authorization.

I submit it is all very confusing, do not you think?

To add to the confusion and in all fairness to the position of the Schenley Co. in this matter, I want to repeat here a long-distance conversation which I had this morning with Mr. Lester Jacoby, president of the Schenley Corporation in New York, and one of his aides.

In the long-distance telephone conversation Mr. Jacoby denied that the Schenley Corporation had ordered the rum loaded in Martinique. He read to me over the telephone what were purported to be cables sent to Martinique telling the people there with whom he was dealing not to ship the rum until authorization had been received in the regular processes and channels.

Mr. Jacoby further told me that at no time did he go to the State Department in behalf of his application. He informed me that all presentations to the State Department were made by representatives of the Martinique Government and that he did not assist them in any way.

I told Mr. Jacoby that in fairness to him and his company I would make this statement on the floor today in connection with the matter now under discussion. I told him, however, that his explanation to me did not change my position in one iota; that there has been favoritism shown, and whether Schenley actually ordered the shipment loaded in Martinique or not did not make a bit of difference in the ultimate conclusion.

The fact remains that the rum was loaded in Martinique in violation of the War Production Board's order. The fact remains that the rum was unloaded in New Orleans in violation of the War Production Board's order; and the fact remains that the rum has ended up in the cellars of the Schenley Corporation.

Now who caused the violation of that order is something, I believe, for the Department of Justice to decide. Schenley says it did not violate the order and had no knowledge of the violation, and as a matter of fact refused to violate the order, but nobody can deny that the

order was violated to the benefit of the Schenley Corporation.

Did the State Department condone this violation; and if it did so, on whose authority did it act?

Certainly no such authority is granted in War Production Board Order M-374, which is supposed to apply to all of the liquor industry, and not to all except Schenley.

And if the violators, whether they be Schenley, the French Government or anybody else, have violated this order, who has given the State Department the power of forgiveness and absolution? Certainly, if the State Department has the power to set aside the War Production Board's orders for any reason at all, it has the same power to change the quotas of other countries as well as Martinique, when an injustice has been worked.

If the State Department has the power at its discretion to supersede an order and make adjustments in order to grant relief to the French at Martinique it certainly has that same power and discretion to grant relief to the Americans of America, and these are the people I am interested in.

After his first long-distance phone call to me this morning, Mr. Jacoby called me again and read to me what was purported to be a letter written to his agent in New Orleans telling him not to accept the consignment of rum under any circumstance until the proper authorization had been given. Mr. Jacoby said that the letter was written after a long-distance telephone call from his agent in New Orleans stating that the rum had arrived.

Mr. Jacoby again insisted that the Schenley Co. had not done a thing to get the rum into this country. He said it was entirely handled by the French Commission.

I asked him if he had attempted to stop the French Commission until proper authorization had been obtained. He replied that he had not.

Of course, he did not, but he knew all the time that these efforts were being made to get the rum in, and it was admitted on a specific authorization after it had been illegally delivered in this country.

If Schenley ordered the stuff loaded, or did not order it loaded, it does not make a particle of difference in the final conclusion. The head of the Schenley Co. informed me during my conversation that it did not make any difference to him whether the stuff had been shipped or not at that time, because he had plenty reserve on hand, and, as a matter of fact, has not put any of this stuff on the market as yet in the United States.

He answers my criticism in better words than I can answer it myself. That is just the point. It does not make any difference to the powerful Mr. Schenley whether he has to wait 30, 40, or 60 days for his merchandise, but it makes plenty of difference to the little fellow, to the little people, who have to operate day by day from the shelf across the counter to the consumer. Why cannot the little fellow get some attention?

So, now let us see what position we find ourselves in.

When this contract was entered into by Cuba and the United States it was agreed that the Cuban Government's quotas for 1944 would be established on the basis of the amount of rum imported in 1943. The Cuban quota was set on a basis of 14,300,000 gallons.

The Mexican quota was set at 1,300,000 gallons. It is important to recognize this fact, however—that when these quotas were set and the effective date of March 15 announced, there had already been imported into the United States 1,205,000 gallons from Mexico, which would leave, in round figures, only 75,000 gallons to be parceled out among applicants who represented some 500,000 gallons which had already been purchased.

In contrast, as of March 15 the total of 9,279,000 proof gallons had been imported from Cuba against its quota of 14,300,000 barrels, which left Cuba approximately 4,000,000 gallons, against which were charged approximately 2,000,000 gallons of distress cases.

In the case of Martinique, the total imports for 1943 were slightly in excess of 1,000,000 gallons, or less than Mexico. Yet, when the quotas were set, Martinique was given a quota of 1,480,000 gallons, approximately 180,000 more than Mexico. And bear in mind that the quota on Martinique was not set until Mr. Schenley loaded his merchandise.

Gentlemen of the House, I am not interested in bringing rum into this country if the alcohol for its production could be better used in the war effort. I am interested, however, in fair play and the protection, particularly of the small American businessman who usually gets it in the neck.

I am not asking anything except that those little American businessmen to whom a dollar means more than a thousand means to Schenley be given at least a chance to survive. I am only asking that those people who, through no fault of their own, and in good faith, entered into bargains and agreements with Mexican distillers to sell them rum and who had issued letters of credit prior to the effective date of the War Production Board order, be allowed to protect their interests and bring their merchandise into this country.

Only 500,000 gallons are involved. Why cannot the State Department increase the Mexican quota by that amount to take care of these cases?

Oh, I know Mr. Schenley is not involved, not to my knowledge anyway. He was only involved in Martinique, and he got fast action there.

I suggested an increase in the quota to Mr. Brown when I talked with him. His reply was that the whole proposition would collapse. Yet in the next breath when I asked in writing for the yardstick on which the quotas were based I was given this answer:

Insofar as practicable, the import quotas for all countries were set at the level of shipments during 1943, which is the basis used for restricting Cuban imports. A few upward deviations from this shipments-in-1943 basis were found necessary in order to avoid injustices to certain supplying countries, but the total quantity of young beverage alcohol involved in such deviations is small.

And what does that mean when you boil it down? It means that the yardstick was made of rubber and is as elastic as the desire of the State Department to apply it in individual and special cases.

Pretty words; pretty phrases: "in order to avoid injustices to certain supplying countries."

How about the injustices to those little fellows who have put their money out for merchandise which they are told they cannot bring into this country while they stand on the docks in New Orleans and see Schenley unload 105,000 gallons, or approximately one-fifth of the total amount involved in Mexico, and realize that another shipment of 360,000 gallons is on the way?

Schenley alone has been allowed by the State Department to bring in almost as much rum as is involved in the entire Mexico question. What answer is there to that?

Mr. Speaker, why do we not lay our cards on the table? Why do we not call Schenley's hand and find out just what his hole card is? Apparently it must be the joker in a game where jokers are wild.

If Schenley has not violated the law I do not know anybody who has violated it. What is it that makes Schenley so powerful as to flaunt the law in the face? I wonder what would have happened if one of my little people from Louisiana had brought rum into this country in defiance of the War Production Board order under the same circumstances which Schenley brought it in.

I wonder what would have happened to them. They would have been put on the public pillory as a horrible example of what happens to those who violate the law, especially in wartime.

Mr. Speaker, I await with interest what the Department of Justice will do after they have reviewed this case. I wonder if the State Department will continue its policy and refuse to raise the quota on Mexico of rum imports while Schenley has carte blanche in Martinique.

The future should be interesting.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEBERT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad the gentleman brought out these facts regarding Schenley. I have a small trading corporation in my home town that had made commitments with distilleries in Venezuela with whom they had been dealing for years, commitments for a small amount of rum. They were notified by the War Production Board after the issuance of order No. M-374, I believe, which forbade import on rum, that they could not ship any more, that no export permits were being issued. They complied with that order; but the distillery in Venezuela notified them after the order was issued there were 28,000 cases on the pier destined to a New York firm. He did not say who they were; I imagine it was some big firm. Those cases were shipped to them, but my little fellow in Seattle could not get his rum.

They put a quota on Venezuela rum. They told him to wait a little while and they would see that his quotas were taken care of. Despite all his commitments

with these reliable firms down there they finally ended up by giving him a permit to bring in 3,160 gallons, one-eightieth of the total. They said there were 80 other firms who had commitments down there. There are not that many distilleries in Venezuela. This rum is going to some other place; somebody else is getting the lion's share of that quota from Venezuela.

I should like the gentleman's permission, if he wishes, to put this letter in the RECORD somewhere along the line following his speech.

Mr. HÉPERT. I shall be very happy to have the gentleman do so. I will say this to the gentleman from Washington, that somebody, some place, somewhere, knows what is going on before the general public knows it. Mr. Jacoby, of course, told me this morning on the telephone that he did not know a thing about it, that they went along in their usual way and, of course, he did go along in his usual way. A big company that is able to pay a man in Washington \$70,000 a year to represent them here by knowing what is going on did not know what was going on. I mentioned to him that I knew his distributor in New Orleans. He came right back and he knew everybody I knew in New Orleans and had already called New Orleans this morning to find out if there was anybody down there who knew me and who could contact me to keep me from making this speech on the floor today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if Mr. Jacoby knows the gentleman from Louisiana like I do he must know that the gentleman from Louisiana is not subject to influence by telephone calls to New Orleans.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Mr. Benjamin F. Castle, president of the Milk Industry Foundation of Washington, D. C., addressed to myself, which is self-explanatory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks regarding a Mr. Harry, a veteran of the Civil War, who died at 101 years of age, and to include therein an article regarding his life and character published in the Licking News, of Licking, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests to submit: First, that I may insert in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times; and, second, that I may insert in the RECORD a speech made by myself keynoting the State Democratic Convention in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday, May 31, 1944.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1173. An act to provide for staying judicial proceedings against the United States in time of war, on claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy, or for towage or salvage services to such vessels, when the Secretary of the Navy certifies that the prosecution of such proceedings would endanger the security of naval operations or interfere therewith, and to authorize the settlement and payment of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1834. An act to amend sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment," approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 314), with respect to the movement at Government expense, of dependents and household effects, of certain military personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 329. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor;

H. R. 1628. An act for the relief of John Hirsch;

H. R. 1635. An act for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search;

H. R. 1984. An act for the relief of Paul Barrere;

H. R. 2008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel;

H. R. 2105. An act extending the time for repayment and authorizing increase of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians;

H. R. 2143. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Christian Wenz;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson;

H. R. 2433. An act for the relief of Bernadine Salmons;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.;

H. R. 2689. An act for the relief of Pete Paluck;

H. R. 2757. An act for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallop, and Mrs. Dora Projansky;

H. R. 3028. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of Ruth Coe;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons;

H. R. 3403. An act to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of Bessie Eason;

H. R. 3570. An act to provide for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3848. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources;

H. R. 4054. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 4710. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1758. An act to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles.

H. R. 329. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor;

H. R. 1628. An act for the relief of John Hirsch;

H. R. 1635. An act for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search;

H. R. 1984. An act for the relief of Paul Barrere;

H. R. 2008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel;

H. R. 2105. An act extending the time for repayment and authorizing increase of the revolving fund for the benefit of the Crow Indians;

H. R. 2143. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain lands within the Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Christian Wenz;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson;

H. R. 2433. An act for the relief of Bernadine Salmons;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Reese Flight Instruction, Inc.;

H. R. 2689. An act for the relief of Pete Paluck;

H. R. 2757. An act for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallop, and Mrs. Dora Projansky;

H. R. 3028. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of Ruth Coe;

H. R. 3136. An act for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons;

H. R. 3403. An act to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3537. An act for the relief of Bessie Eason;

H. R. 3570. An act to provide for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3848. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest reserves;

H. R. 4054. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Calcasieu River at or near Lake Charles, La.;

H. R. 4710. An act authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain landing craft and district craft for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to provide for the disposition of the proceeds to accrue as a result of the interlocutory judgment of the Court of Claims in the suit brought against the United States by the Menominee Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous motion, adjourned until Wednesday, May 31, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will continue its consideration of H. R. 4486, relative to the post-war disposition of merchant vessels, on Tuesday, June 13, 1944, at 10 a. m.

Persons desiring to be heard should notify the clerk of the committee in writing as soon as possible.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

1579. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill extending the provisions of Public Law No. 47, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to reemployment committeemen of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1580. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1581. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 25, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination and survey of Hay Creek, Goodhue County, Minn., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1582. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, transmitting a report on hourly remuneration rates by occupations in the transportation industry (H. Doc. No. 623); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARE: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4899. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4771. A bill to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; with amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BARRETT: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1335. A bill to amend the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202); without amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1654. A bill to authorize the acquisition, rehabilitation, and operation of the facilities for the public in the Olympic National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. H. R. 4729. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4825. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Des Moines, Iowa, September 10 to 14, 1944, inclusive; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN. Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 87. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN. Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 88. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of

additional copies of the report (No. 1311) of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, dealing with the leadership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 567. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2241, to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument as created by Presidential Proclamation No. 2578, dated March 15, 1943, and to restore the area embraced within and constituting said monument to its status as part of the Teton National Forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. S. 1112. An act for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge; without amendment (Rept. No. 1530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. S. 1247. An act for the relief of the Bishopville Milling Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. S. 1326. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka; without amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2237. A bill for the relief of John F. Cooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2530. A bill for the relief of John M. O'Connell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2845. A bill for the relief of John J. Beaton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3548. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Nelson and W. E. Nelson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3590. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; without amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3813. A bill for the relief of J. Ralph Datesman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4528. A bill for the relief of L. M. Feller Co. and Wendell C. Graus; without amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4900 (by request). A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 4901. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of Moore Air Field; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. J. Res. 286. Joint resolution providing for operating naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to create a committee or Federal and State relations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 568. Resolution requesting information from the Attorney General as to arrival of refugees; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 569. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4771, a bill to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5768. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. Nehard Hansen and 41 other citizens of Waterville, Kans., requesting that cotton materials and overalls which are now being produced be placed at their disposal that they may continue to bring about the production of essential foods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5769. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Native Sons of the Golden West, Grand Parlor, San Francisco, Calif., relating to House bill 238; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5770. Also, resolution of Native Sons of the Golden West, Grand Parlor, San Francisco, Calif., relating to amending the reclamation law limiting the use of project water in the operation and administration of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

5771. Also, resolution of Native Sons of the Golden West, Grand Parlor, San Francisco, Calif., relating to taxation of federally owned lands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5772. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the director, political action committee, Local 840, United Automobile-Aircraft-Agricultural Implement Workers of America (U. A. W.-C. I. O.), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continuation of the Fair Employment Practice Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 31, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 9, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, author of liberty, Thou dost behold the goodly heritage of our fair land where, amid the noisy on-going of life's busy traffic, are guarded the sacred islands of tranquillity where rests the dust of warrior hosts. From sea to sea of the homeland this radiant morning, where the grass has been trod-

den by reverent feet, and in little patches of foreign soil, where is kept the bivouac of our valiant dead, on countless graves we see the cross and the flag blending in their mute testimony. May that cross interpret the flag for our steadfast yet anxious hearts in this dread hour as the sharpened arrow of our might is pulled on the taut string of national strength. May that cross speak to the flag of strength that is increased by its spending, of life that is saved by its losing, of greatness that is measured by its serving.

Our glad hearts rejoice that by the sacrifice of which that linked cross and flag is the symbol—

"O'er the mounds where sleep the slaughtered,

Fired by hopes for which they died,
Lured by dreams which arched their heavens—

Human rights so long denied;
From the jealous feuds of ages
Moves a conquering army's van;
'Tis the crusade of the nations
For the brotherhood of man."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GUFFEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, May 29, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 29, 1944, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 683) to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1941) to amend the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3054) to amend the Expediting Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (No. 1311) of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, dealing with the leadership of the Congress of Industrial Organizations Political Action Committee.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 29th instant,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. DOWNEY), on May 30, 1944, signed the enrolled bill (S. 1758) to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reynolds
Austin	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Buck	Hayden	Stewart
Burton	Holman	Taft
Butler	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Capper	La Follette	Truman
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Cordon	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Murdock	Weeks
Downey	Murray	Wheeler
Eastland	Nye	Wherry
Ellender	O'Daniel	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willson
Gerry	Radcliffe	
Gillette	Reed	

Mr. GEORGE. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.